

**Clifton Village RPS – Objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Order CAE/NMT/P/888.**  
**Appendix 3**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Objector</b>	<b>Summary of Objection/Comment</b>	<b>App. 4 ref.*</b>
1	3	The scheme will cause hardship to members who use the Clifton College Sports Facility during the hours of operation.	4.1
		The scheme hours should be reduced to Monday to Friday 9am-5pm with free parking for up to two hours.	3.4
2		The status of the bays on the north side of Percival Road in front of 43 Canynge Road is affected by the off road parking permission that has been granted to 41 Canynge Road (access of Percival Road). Percival Road has a pinch point here as the road is not wide enough for parking on both sides of the road.	5.18
		A telephone based parking system, using geo-aware services of smart phones, should be introduced. This would be a better solution than unsightly parking machines. Books of tickets could be bought from local vendors for those without a suitable device. This would also enable the parking solution to be reconfigured by software to solve the inevitable teething problems.	4.1.5
3		Objects to the scheme as she believes that she will be forced to look for other employment as she suffers from arthritis and will not be able to walk to work.	4.4
		Using public transport would mean that she would have to wait outside work in the early hours of the morning. This does not feel safe due to recent attacks on women.	4.3 4.6
4		Objects to the current plan on Gloucester Street. The single yellow line needs to remain because the flow of traffic has increased substantially since the Bridge House was converted to flats. When cars park on both sides of the road, access is restricted and it would be impossible for emergency vehicles to get through if the yellow line was removed. Requests that double yellow lines are placed down both sides of Gloucester Street to protect access/egress.	5.16
5		Objects to the scheme as members of staff are paid minimum wage and often car share to reduce costs and have to drop their children off to school on the way. It is not practical for them to cycle or catch the bus. It is unreasonable to expect older members of staff to have to walk to work at 5:00am in the morning as there are no buses and they are too expensive.	4.4
6		Currently car shares with a colleague to get to work. It will not be possible to use alternative transport as this would involve multiple buses and it is too far to walk.	4.4
7		Currently car shares with a colleague to get to work. It will not be possible to use alternative transport as she would have to catch multiple buses and it is too far to walk.	4.4
		Residents move to the area knowing that there is a college, a zoo and a sports centre there and that the College owns a lot of the land around the area.	1.2

8	Objects to the scheme as he lives in Barton Hill and relies on his car to get to work. Currently car shares with a colleague and the scheme will also affect them.	4.4
9	Objects to the parking scheme as it will affect his job. He lives in Easton and currently car shares with colleagues. It is not possible for everyone to walk or cycle great distances and alternative methods of transport are not good enough and are far too expensive.	4.4
10	The roads should not belong to residents who have cars. It contradicts Bristol's 'Green City' status if residents are allowed more than one permit.	3.1.2
	The installation, upkeep and monitoring of the scheme will use up money that the Council should be spending on necessities such as providing houses and public transport.	3.1.1
11	<p>Objects to the scheme as they live outside of Clifton and will no longer have anywhere to park.</p> <p>Public transport is not an option as there are no direct buses from Westbury-on-Trym to Clifton and this will stop her from being able to do the school run.</p> <p>Her work deals with many customers but the parking zone will restrict the number of people coming into their office.</p>	4.4
12	In the feedback report it is noted that the potential to acquire additional permits will be provided. However there is no definition as how a business will be assessed to fall into the 'small' or 'large' category.	4.3
	The parking capacity test takes no account of the building design, usage and density of occupancy or employee type (full time versus part-time ratio). It is not equitable that his business will be heavily penalised as it is a densely populated office over five floors rather than a wide fronted property. His business will also be penalised by the fact that they have no parking bays located at their frontage. It appears that the basis of the scheme is being altered through this change as there is a shift from considering parking across the whole CV area to a degree of implied 'ownership' over parking adjacent to a property.	4.3
	Seven permits are insufficient for large businesses. Many staff already commute for over an hour a day as they come from far afield. They need their cars at work to travel to their Filton office and to carry equipment to site visits throughout the day. Recruitment is already challenging as they need specialist staff and the scheme will make finding and retaining staff much more difficult.	4.3
	Transport links to Clifton are not good enough. Their concerns are about the additional travel time that public transport would involve more than the cost. North and East Bristol has no park & ride and there is no car park in Clifton. Clifton Village needs better links.	4.5
	There is no supporting evidence to demonstrate that the scheme will improve parking or traffic yet it will have a detrimental impact on businesses.	1.4

		The scheme should not have been fast tracked as a key consultation stage was missed. Additional consultation should be carried out so that a better scheme can be developed.	2.1.1
13		Many of the buildings in the north east part of the scheme are not residential properties and have ample off street parking already; many roads run alongside open spaces and playing fields. Cannot see the why there is a need for a parking scheme in the north at all.	1.2
14		Objects to the scheme as they need to park their car outside their work in order to their job. It is not possible to walk or get the bus as they are required to drive to clients' premises.	4.4
15		It is unfair to penalise car drivers when public transport links are woefully inadequate. Staff at places such as Clifton College and Bristol Zoo Gardens will be forced to seek employment elsewhere as they will have no means of arriving at work in time to start their shifts.	4.5
16		Identical to objection 15.	
		Improving public transport should be prioritised over this scheme. If there were not such restricted routes and high fares, she would happily not use her car.	4.5
17		Finding parking space near Regent Street is difficult at the moment but the proposed limitations would make it intolerable. Those that live in flats on roads with limited free parking at the moment would be severely disadvantaged as they would have to move their cars to find a parking space on Saturdays.	3.3
		The scheme is aimed purely at generating additional funds with the majority of the burden being placed on residents. The scheme costs should be found from council tax receipts.	3.1.1
		Persisting with the scheme in face of the opposition from residents is contrary to the principle of local representation that councils are based on.	2.2.2 2.2.3
18		Clifton Village has many independent shops that will be hurt by the introduction of Pay and Display. If Pay and Display machines are installed they should, allow 30 minutes free parking to limit damage to shops, be exempt for resident permit holders and only be placed on the 'high street' and not on the more residential roads of Clifton.	4.1
		The first permit should be free of charge as it is in other towns.	3.1.2
		The scheme should be reviewed at six months and then annually. If the majority of residents still dislike it or businesses have suffered then the scheme should be scrapped.	6.2
		Commuter parking is not the main issue in Clifton Village as parking at evenings and weekends is far worse than during Monday to Friday 9am-5pm.	3.4
		The Council will be forced to employ more people to administer and enforce the scheme. The Council should aspire to employ as few as people as possible to provide the service required and	3.1.1

		desired by the residents that pay council tax.	
19		Transport links from North Somerset to Clifton are close to non-existent. If a scheme is going to be introduced then the infrastructure needs to be in place to support it. The scheme will mean that an additional 40/45 minutes will be added each way to his commute. This penalises people who value family time and want to spend time with their children.	4.5.2
20		Objects to the scheme as public transport links to the zoo are very poor, giving families few options but to travel by car to the zoo. The vast majority of visitors to the zoo are families with young children and getting public transport is more difficult for them.	4.5
		She lives six miles away from the zoo and public transport is not flexible enough to allow her to get to work on time whilst dropping off her children to school. Public transport should be improved in order to give people a viable alternative to driving.	4.6 4.3.1 4.3.2
21		Objects to Harley Mews being included within the scheme when it is a private road and not public highway.	5.3
22		Objects to the scheme because if she didn't have a car or could not park near the college then she would not be able to take her children to school or pick them up. There are no buses after 8pm. If the scheme comes in she will have to park on the Downs and then walk across. This is acceptable in the summer but is dangerous in winter.	4.4
23		Works at Clifton College as a maintenance worker and parks on College Fields. If he couldn't drive there, it would take him two buses to get to work.	4.4
		He and his colleagues spend money in the local area and there would be a knock on effect to local businesses if they could no longer park there.	4.1.3 1.3
		If parking permits are issued to everyone the scheme will do nothing for the environment and its only purpose will be to make money.	4.4 3.5
24		Objects to double yellow lines outside their garage and along the length of Royal York Crescent as her husband works from home and has to use the car frequently throughout the day. It is not feasible to put the car in their garage each time for a short time.	5.5
		It would be better to have no yellow lines at all on that side but to install residents' parking bays in between the garages. This would provide more parking spaces in the street.	5.5
25		He will no longer be able to park his car in the area when he comes to work. Walking or cycling long distances will be difficult due to medical reasons. He needs to start work very early in the morning and public transport does not go directly to Clifton from St George. He would need to catch two buses which would be expensive and would not guarantee getting to work on time.	4.4
26		Lives on a private road where some, but not all, properties have a single parking space. He will not	3.5.1

	receive the same benefit as households with a garage or driveway as he will not be able to park his second car in front of it. He objects to the scheme as he is not entitled to apply for three permits like everyone else.	
27	Public transport does not offer a viable alternative. The buses are generally un-timetabled, unreliable and expensive. It is too far for his partner to walk to school with their young son. The scheme will prevent them from working effectively. His family are not commuting, they just need to drive short distances to their work/school places.	4.5
28	He does not have any option of public transport as the limited rail times means that this is not a viable option.	4.6
29	Clifton Village is a tourist destination and customers/visitors cannot make their way around the shops, look at the goods on display, wait to pay for them and make their way back to their car within one hour.	4.2
30	If she is unable to park near her place of work she will be forced to take two buses, extending her commute by an hour. It could also prove dangerous during the winter evenings.	4.4
	There are a number of offices whose employees provide trade to the various shops and cafes of Clifton Village.	4.1.3
	The scheme is a cynical attempt to squeeze more money out of residents and businesses.	3.1.1
31	Clifton Village will lose its quirkiness and properties in Clifton will lose value.	1.4
	Car parks and improvements to public transport should take place before a scheme is implemented. Bristol is full of hills and not everybody is fit enough to cycle everywhere.	4.5
	The scheme has been progressed in an undemocratic way. Their freedom and citizenship rights are being taken away.	2.2
	The scheme will force businesses to move out of the area. This will also mean that the local shops and cafes lose customers.	4.1.3
32	Emily Place, Camp Road and Canynge Road should have the same operational hours as the southern half of Clifton Village, otherwise the northern section will become a free car park. This is against the spirit of the scheme.	3.4.2
	The Mall 27-33 should be shared parking as there is a large residential development above this area.	3.3.2
33	People should be encouraged to come to Clifton Village and they have no choice but to drive as the bus services are not reliable.	4.5
34	Is concerned about the number of permits issued and the 1 hour maximum stay limit. Four hour pay	4.2

	<p>&amp; display would be better.</p> <p>If businesses are forced to move from Clifton then the Village traders will suffer as well as this is their customer base.</p> <p>Public transport is appalling and the park and ride is not a viable option.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.5</p>
35	<p>Objects to the scheme because one hour parking is a serious threat to business. Their customers need parking for up to five hours. Does not wish to attend furious meetings with shouting traders but does feel the same.</p> <p>Enquires whether it will be possible for her to obtain a permit for one employee that lives 40 mins away.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>
36	<p>Wholeheartedly supports the roll-out of the RPS within Clifton and across the City.</p> <p>Believes that a more balanced wording might be "How to comment" as "how to object" assumes that all comments will be negative.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>
37	<p>Public transport in Bristol is inadequate, some people commuting have no access to buses or train stations and it would take too much time to get to work.</p> <p>Businesses will be ruined by staff being forced to leave, which will have an adverse effect on the shops and cafes of Clifton Village as they will lose their customers.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
38	<p>Public transport is much more expensive than driving to work. Not being able to drive to work will mean that he cannot get back in time to take part in hobbies and activities and it will affect his family life.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
39	<p>Compliments those involved with the revised scheme, it seems to be well thought through and addresses the concerns expressed during the previous consultation.</p> <p>Hopes it can be implemented as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p>
40	<p>Objects to the scheme because her business is time orientated and she has clients undergoing treatments and procedures taking 2-4 hours plus.</p> <p>A large proportion of her clients visit the shops and restaurants in the Village. The money they spend helps support the traders. The recession hit everyone hard and charging people for parking is a mistake.</p> <p>The proposed residents' only parking areas are very large compared to the amount put forward for potential customers for the Village.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.3.2</p>

		<p>The parking situation is not helped by a huge amount of multiple occupancy properties. There will not be enough room for people to park despite the residents' parking scheme. This will be made worse by proposals to remove large parts of free parking spaces that are constantly being vacated and filled by customers and clients i.e. Royal York Crescent has had one whole side of parking removed.</p> <p>Says the current plans are not fit for purpose and significant change is required before they will work. One hour parking is insufficient for village businesses.</p> <p>A shuttle bus service between Long Ashton park and the village would be great.</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.5.2</p>
41		Would like double yellow lines removed from their access.	5.4
42		The scheme would force her to look for other employment as she would be unable to afford the parking fees. May also need to arrange childcare which would be a further unaffordable expense.	4.4
43		<p>The scheme is trying to force people to use alternative methods of transport. Cycling is not an option and public transport vastly increases commute time and is not an option. She requires her car for site visits, which will mean parking for part of the day on local roads; it is not practical to catch buses to site visits.</p> <p>Objects to her Council tax payment being used to fund the scheme. It will not make any money for further infrastructure as it will just pay for itself due to the high cost of maintaining the parking meters.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
44		<p>Has noted that parking is permitted on the south side of Gloucester. Due to the narrow nature of the road, cars park on the pavement which causes considerable damage to the pavement and cellars.</p> <p>Large delivery vehicles constantly use the pavement adjacent to to load and unload. Bollards previously protected access to this road and this should be reinstated.</p>	<p>5.15</p> <p>5.1</p>
45		The efficiency of public transport is absolutely appalling. The supported bus service has failed to keep to its unrealistic bus timetable scheduling.	4.5
46		<p>The scheme is intended to bring in revenue for Bristol City Council</p> <p>It will kill her trade and lead to large numbers of businesses failing.</p>	<p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.1</p>
47		Would like the double yellow lines removed from across access.	5.4

	<p>The scheme is not in the interests of residents, businesses, shoppers or visitors. It is not needed six days a week from 9-9. An hour a day would prevent commuter parking. Saturday restrictions are completely unnecessary. The scheme will drive businesses out which will ultimately cause more air pollution.</p> <p>One hour maximum stay is just not enough for the businesses.</p> <p>Does not mind paying for a permit but only if she could find a parking space.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
48	<p>Objects on the grounds that insufficient attention has been paid to providing suitable parking for employees of businesses located in Clifton Village, particularly for those travelling from the northern side of the City.</p> <p>Objects to the proposals as she does not live near a direct bus route, walking would take too long and the office has no changing facilities.</p> <p>Introducing a parking scheme in Bristol will just shift the parking 'problem' from Clifton.</p> <p>Employers in Clifton Village will find that the lack of parking for staff will become a major issue.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.5.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>4.4</p>
49	<p>Objects to the current proposals as there is a totally inadequate number of permit holders bays provided on Richmond Terrace. An increase of permit holders' bays is urgently required. Victoria Square has been allocated more permit holders' bays yet it is closer to Clifton Village.</p>	<p>3.3</p>
50	<p>The Council has not addressed the concerns raised by the BID.</p> <p>States that the current plans do not reflect an outcome that is fair to residents and traders. The scheme is heavily weighted against traders. They will not be able to trade if their customers cannot park.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>2.1.3</p> <p>1.3</p>
51	<p>Objects to the scheme as his journey to work on public transport would take 1.5 hours and it is unreliable and expensive.</p> <p>The streets he currently parks on have no residents as they only park adjacent to College property.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>1.2</p>
52	<p>The scheme will drive young professionals out of the area that need two cars but cannot afford the additional costs.</p>	<p>3.1.2</p>
53	<p>Objects to pay &amp; display on the hour every hour between 09:00-21:00.</p> <p>He has never noticed any problems with people being able to park their vehicles in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>1.2</p>



		The scheme as it may possibly force him to look for work in a different area. There is no direct bus route to get him to and from work.	4.6
54		<p>As a contractor he regularly attends properties within the village and requires more than 1 hour parking. He will also lose business if he cannot find somewhere to park. It will stop people from shopping in the Village if there is a limit to the time you can spend. This will then ruin business.</p> <p>The Village makes revenue in the evenings and restricting the parking until 9pm will kill those businesses as well.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p>
55		It is not possible for many people in her organisation to use public transport as they live too far away and often have to take equipment such as heavy files with them into work. Colleagues often have to use their cars to get to meetings in locations that are impossible to reach without a car.	4.5
56		<p>Objects to the scheme as they believe that commuters take the empty spaces left by residents in the morning and residents take the spaces back when the commuters leave in the evening. There is plenty of free two hours swap over parking space for short stay visitors.</p> <p>Objects to the scheme as she has to use her car frequently throughout the day parking in various around Clifton for short periods of time. The change in parking will make it very difficult and expensive.</p> <p>The business she works for would need at least 10-13 permits and the permits on offer do not seem to meet their requirements.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.3</p>
57		<p>There has been a total lack of consultation with local businesses as to their needs.</p> <p>The planned allocation of three permits to each business is too limited. The restriction in the number of available permits will severely disrupt and limit their ability to operate effectively.</p> <p>The requirement to purchase additional visitors' permits is limiting and will deter customers and clients from visiting our offices to conduct their business.</p> <p>The proposed cost of the permits is too high. Businesses already pay a higher level of rates to the council and fail to see how this is fair or reasonable. They are a small single office independent trader and any such inflated costs have a more noticeable impact.</p>	<p>2.1.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4</p> <p>4</p>
58		<p>Objects to the scheme as they feel that visitors will be unable to park, for example the Avon Gorge Hotel has very limited parking of its own and this will inevitably discourage people from booking the venue. Delegates to Engineers house will find it impossible to park within the vicinity. Staff who work at these companies will find it extremely difficult to park during the working day.</p> <p>There will be a great many people for whom public transport is not a viable alternative, either</p>	<p>4.3.2</p> <p>4.5</p>

		because it does not exist or because the nature of their job entails them travelling to other locations during the working day.	
59		Requests the removal of double yellow lines from across their access.	5.4
60		Objects to the scheme as a resident and as a business owner. It is already difficult for visitors to park anywhere near where they live.	3.3.1
		Clients have appointments lasting 60-90mins and the 60 minute parking restriction would be seriously prohibitive.	4.2
61		He commutes from Somerset each day and public transport would increase his daily commute to four hours if the services are running on time. The park and ride facilities are not suitable as after traveling such a distance it will mean adding a further 40 minutes to the journey and it is expensive. Hiring a private garage/parking space is far too expensive.	4.5
		At the moment workers park in residents' spaces when they have gone to work and leave when they return. This situation suits everyone.	1.2
		People will be forced to leave their jobs unless some sensible provision is made to accommodate people who work in the area and need to park for 8 hours a day 5 days a week.	4.6
		The Village will suffer as their custom keeps many of the shops and cafes in business.	4.1.3
62		They have very limited off street parking at the Hotel and that the guests are obliged to use on-street parking. Alternative long term parking has not been catered for in the scheme. The majority of guests are visitors to Bristol arriving by car but then opt to travel into Bristol City Centre by bus therefore not contributing to congestion. Guests at the Hotel make a considerable financial contribution to Bristol as does the Hotel in terms of rates and rent.	4.3.2
63		Identical to objection 41.	
64		Objects to the scheme as the new proposals do not show any parking provision for residents of Waterloo Street. The previous scheme prior to this revision showed shared use parking.	3.3.2
		Also states that the scheme will adversely affect the amenity of properties in Waterloo Street.	1.4
65		Same as objection 64.	

66		Supports the scheme.	Comments noted
67		<p>If the scheme comes in they will have to cycle to work as there is no easy public transport route either by bus or train. It will prove difficult to run the business with inadequate parking or transport to the area.</p> <p>Their business would be classified as a small business. This means that they could only apply for three permits. Three permits would not be enough as they need their cars to go out on site visits.</p> <p>Less people are likely to come to the shops in Clifton due to the parking scheme.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4</p>
68		<p>Objects to the scheme as public transport is not cheap enough for people to get to Clifton on minimum wage. Buses are not reliable and frequent enough as her journey via bus would take 1:30 hours and be expensive. Would consider parking on the downs and walking to the Village but is not comfortable to do so for security reasons. Cannot cycle to work as it is too far, too expensive to buy and maintain a bike and there are no facilities to store her bike or shower at work. There will be childcare costs as people will have to leave earlier to get to work.</p> <p>Businesses in Clifton Village will close as footfall in the Village will slow rapidly.</p> <p>Permits are too expensive, why is it not possible to pay for permits on a monthly basis.</p> <p>Believes that this is a money making scheme.</p> <p>Even the residents here are not happy about this as still they would not be guaranteed a space and do not see why they should have to pay for the privilege.</p> <p>Why before the deadline of 11<sup>th</sup> of April meters are already being put in place? Why does Bristol City Council feel that our views are of no consequence.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>2.2.2</p>
69		<p>The objection process is a 'tick box' exercise following a process which is a legal requirement. There is no intention of listening to what anyone has to say.</p> <p>Has asked for statistics that show the effect the scheme will have on the number of cars commuting into the City but this is not known.</p> <p>The area where city centre residents park is non-residential and the fact that there is plenty of parking space in the early evening suggests that it is full of commuters during the day. Quay Point</p>	<p>2.2.2</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1.2</p>

		residents should be able to park in non-residential streets.	
		Commuters are actively being encouraged to drive into the City, causing unnecessary congestion. Residents are being encouraged to have more cars by offering three spaces per household and students are being offered spaces over residents who pay Council Tax.	1.1
70		Requests two to four hour pay and display parking for patients, clients and visitors in the adjacent streets. Litfield Place, Harley Place and the top of Camp Road will otherwise become empty as residents already have off street parking.	4.2
71		Believes the plans are flawed. The difference in finishing time from the north of the scheme to the south of the scheme will put extra pressure on the north, creating a parking problem.	3.4
		Queries the validity and legality of basing charges on vehicle excise duty. Car owners are already taxed on their vehicle emissions.	3.2.2
72		The scheme will increase her travel time considerably as the Park & Ride does not have a direct bus to Clifton. Her travel costs would also increase as she would have to pay for a bus pass whilst still paying for her car. There is no car park to enable staff to still drive in and then walk to Clifton.	4.5.2
		She would no longer use the shops in Clifton as without the use of the car as carrying shopping would be an inconvenience. Businesses will ultimately re-locate at the end of their lease probably outside Bristol City Centre with consequential loss in business rates revenue. The loss of employment in the Village will have a huge impact on the sustainability of Clifton Village which will have a negative impact on the residents.	4.1.3
73		Employees will look elsewhere to work as they simply will not be able to get to work. This will cause Clifton's business sector to collapse.	4.6
		Lives outside Bristol and the public transport links are limited as the trains and buses are unreliable and there are no direct links to Clifton.	4.5
		Workers in Clifton should be given a permit to park where they want or a discounted permit for West End car park as £10 per day is too expensive.	4.3 4.6.4
74		The Fosseway is a very narrow road, particularly so at the Clifton Road end of the road. Asks whether the double yellow lines around the build out on the north side of the road can be extended by 6m. Cars often park partly on the build out making the situation even worse.	5.9
75		Public transport does not accommodate people who have to work either very early in the morning or late at night. West End car park is too expensive for people on low wages to afford.	4.5 4.6.4
		The additional expenses will force him to look for other work and make people jobless if they cannot	4.1.3

		find alternative employment. The company he works for will lose a lot of business as many people currently park nearby and walk to the shop.	
76		<p>Objects to the current proposals as the double yellow lines have been removed from the Paragon, which would mean that cars could park on both sides of the road. It is not possible to do this as the road is barely two vehicles in width.</p> <p>The double yellow lines which are presently on the road should be retained. This does not include the end of the road which was proposed to have double yellow lines.</p>	5.6
77		<p>Objects to the proposals as he believes the scheme is anti-employment as the company will be unable to attract new employees and will lose existing key staff.</p> <p>It will waste time as employees will have to move their cars during the day to avoid fines or will have to spend longer travelling between home and work. Employees who currently work late when required will no longer do so as the buses do not run in the evening.</p> <p>The scheme will also be costly as staff will regularly have to pay parking fees, the company will lose customers due to the inconvenience and will have to move offices.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.1.1</p>
78		<p>Public transport is not a possibility when travelling to work. She has two small children and needs to drop them off and pick them up at specific times. She also needs to use her car for work purposes to travel within the South West region and would not be able to do this on public transport because of the areas that she needs to visit. There are no car parks within reasonable distance within her place of work. The scheme would mean that she would be unable to continue to work in Clifton</p> <p>If the scheme is intending to stop people parking in Clifton and walking to the city centre, why is it not possible for businesses based in Clifton to be allocated a sensible number of permits?</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.3</p>
79		They bought the property as it had an off street parking space. Since the garage is too small to fit a car in, they park in front of the garage. The implementation of the double yellow lines would restrict parking opportunities even further.	5.5
80		<p>By making the areas around the Zoo pay and display or permit holder only the situation will not improve. The zoo will have to use all the spaces for guests and staff will have nowhere to park.</p> <p>Staff at the Zoo work from 8:00am to 5:20 and the pay display maximum stay will not cover this. Using public transport would increase her travel time and expenses and is less straight forward. The scheme will force her to become unemployed and to look for work elsewhere.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.6</p>
81		<p>If they cannot park in Clifton they will park in the city centre which will in turn increase traffic. Parking in Clifton allows her to stay fit and healthy as if she have to park in the centre they will not be able to walk and therefore not get their daily exercise.</p> <p>She will no longer use the shops on the way home which will lead to a loss of revenue to these shops.</p>	<p>1.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p>

		If commuters have to use the city parking there will not be any spaces for holiday makers, thus reducing tourism and loss of revenue.	4.6.4
82		Current proposals show a double yellow line outside their house. They do not want this double yellow line on any part of the frontage of our property and would like to be residents' parking only.	5.4
		Believes the plans are fundamentally flawed and will provide no positive benefit. The scheme is just designed to provide extra income to the council. It will be expensive to implement and administer.	3.1.1
83		If they cannot park in Clifton or the surrounding area then they will have to drive into the City Centre, thus increasing traffic. Their route takes them across the suspension bridge. If they cannot park in Clifton there will be a loss of revenue for the bridge and increased traffic on Cumberland Basin. Parking allows them to stay fit and healthy due to the amount of walking they have to do. If they do not have to walk as much as they do, it will affect their health.	4.6.4
		They will no longer be able to go to the shops on their way home which will lead to a loss of revenue to these shops.	4.1.3
		If commuters have to use the city centre parking there will not be any spaces for holiday makers, thus reducing tourism and loss of revenue.	4.6.4
84		Would like the double yellow lines removed from outside their garage.	5.4
		Objects to the scheme and requests more consultation.	2
85		Objects to the proposed idea to put a double yellow line along the length of Royal York Crescent. As this will reduce resident parking by about 25 cars.	5.5
		Would like the double yellow lines removed from outside two of their garages.	5.5
86		Approves of the scheme in general but has two issues with the detail.	
		The streets where pay and display limit is proposed for one hour should be increased to two hours if not three, as one hour is not long enough for people to visit Clifton.	4.2
		There needs to be increased frequency and better time keeping on the 8 and 9 bus routes from First Bus. There would be much less reason to use a car to travel to/from Clifton if these frequencies were increased to 10min at peak times and 20min in the evening.	4.5.1
		The campaign group against the scheme have circulated misleading leaflets, stating that a permit costs £192 when the first permit actually costs £48, claiming "Clifton will die" when the pay & display will increase parking for visitors and that too many permits will be sold in order to make money when	2.1 2.2

		<p>this has never been a problem in Kingsdown. The most recent leaflet is entitled “Goodbye to friends and family”, yet residents have asked for a later finish.</p> <p>Opposition to the scheme is driven by people that are not Clifton Village residents but commuters who do not want to lose their free parking spaces. They should not be listened to.</p>	<p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>
87		<p>Objects to the scheme as they had already emailed requesting that the double yellow lines removed outside their garages.</p> <p>The current proposals show a total ban on all parking on the north side of the Crescent. This would severely reduce the number of spaces currently available to residents in a street where most houses are multi-occupancy.</p> <p>A scheme which restricts rather than improves residents’ ability to park is illogical. Placing double yellow lines across all of the garages in Royal York Crescent will cause a huge inconvenience and access difficulties.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p>
88		<p>The scheme will have a serious effect on their business as they require their cars to visit customers on a daily basis. They will not be able to apply for enough permits for all of their staff. There are no other provisions for staff travelling to work such as a local car park for their cars close by.</p> <p>The scheme will make them seriously consider closing their office in Clifton and moving out of Bristol entirely. Bristol City Council will also lose the business rates from their business when they move from the area. The Council will struggle to find another business to take up the premises with the Clifton RPS in force.</p> <p>Local businesses will then lose out on the money that their members of staff spend in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
89		<p>Requests further information about the proposal for Royal York Crescent.</p> <p>Owns the garage and should be allowed to park outside it without incurring a fine. Installing double yellow lines effectively removes a considerable amount of parking, which will cause havoc to anyone living there. Not everyone is able to use their garage so the space outside it is valuable. Asks whether anyone with a permit would be able to park outside the garage if the double yellow lines were removed. This would be unfair as they should be able to use it when they want to.</p> <p>One solution might be to make the space outside the garages allocated permit holders’ spaces, by marking them as reserved for a specific car.</p> <p>If the double yellow lines are intended to ease the sometimes difficult access problems, a one way system would be a better solution.</p> <p>If parking meters are installed in Clifton they should not be restricted to one hour because all of the businesses will suffer. There should be an option of parking for up to four hours.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p>

90	<p>The double yellow lines proposed along the garage side of Royal York Crescent will reduce the number of spaces by at least 35. This undermines the purpose of the RPS as it will not have a positive impact on the local quality of life as it will be even more difficult to find a parking place.</p> <p>The parking bays along the garden side should be painted in a slanted fashion instead of parallel to the kerb so that spaces are not reduced even more.</p>	5.5
91	<p>The scheme is not being proposed for the people of Clifton but to raise revenue.</p> <p>They do their weekly shopping in Clifton but the RPS will force them to take their money elsewhere.</p>	3.1.1 4.1.1
92	Supports the current plan to introduce a residents' parking scheme in Clifton.	
93	<p>The scheme is an additional tax for Council Tax payers. The Council should look at other areas to raise revenue or save costs.</p> <p>The scheme will not reduce congestion as people will still traverse the city until roads are designed and constructed for modern use. Bristol is used as an alternative route for driving south on the M5 and vice versa especially when congested.</p> <p>The Whiteladies Road redesign work is dangerous as the lanes are too narrow with buses often using part of the opposite lane.</p>	3.1.1 1.1 5.1
94	<p>Objects to the current proposals to make Gloucester Street a PPA as this will restrict access and create constant parking issues with vehicles parking on both sides of the road. Refuse and delivery vehicles are often unable to make it up Gloucester street when the cars are parked badly. Gloucester Street is not a through road and traffic coming down the street often has to reverse back up it as there is no facility for turning.</p> <p>Following the completion of the flats in Bridge House the increased traffic has made parking a nightmare. The single yellow line that was previously put in place works very well.</p> <p>Pavement parking is a regular occurrence in Gloucester Street and the current proposals promote this. This forces pedestrians into the road which is dangerous.</p>	5.15 5.15 5.15
95	The scheme will make businesses in Clifton Village fold which will affect the nature of Clifton. He is objecting in spite of the fact that he finds it very difficult to park on his road but he is concerned that Clifton will die if the scheme is introduced.	4.1
96	<p>The proposals might create or worsen parking in another area.</p> <p>Inhibit non-residential and commercial activity.</p>	1.1 1.3 4.1.1



	<p>Provide insufficient space for all residents' vehicles and parking for visitors will be restricted by virtue of space, permit availability or time limits.</p> <p>Shoppers may use some areas, if no alternative parking available, visitors displaced and as such knock on effect on the economy of the town.</p> <p>Cost of Traffic Regulation Orders, management of permits, reliance on residents to renew permits.</p> <p>Additional cost of signing and white lining and future maintenance.</p> <p>Enforcement by Civil Enforcement Officers is manpower intensive.</p> <p>Permit is not site specific. Permit is for an area not outside someone's house.</p> <p>Knock on effect to adjacent areas with parking.</p> <p>A large number of surveys will have to be carried out. Daytime, evening, night time parking surveys, business requirements.</p> <p>Some areas such as terraced properties with no off street parking have insufficient road space for every resident let alone visitors. The permit does not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p>Parking schemes have been unsuccessful or unpopular in other areas and the disadvantages are cited again and again by local authority reports such as Nottinghamshire and Tameside.</p> <p>States that parking in Clifton works in a fluid way over the course of the day with variations in school drop off, workers, contractors and those returning from work.</p> <p>The scheme has already been voted against 49:2 by local Councillors.</p> <p>Clifton residents will be charged more and there are more restrictions than other areas.</p> <p>Bristol City Council has not completed adequate research in advance. There has not been appropriate research of traffic flows in and around the Village, or studies of potential spaces available for residents and businesses.</p> <p>Parking limit of 1 hour in the heart of the Village is restrictive to trade.</p> <p>Business permit numbers are too small and businesses will not be able to carry out their work</p>	<p>4.3 3.3 3.6</p> <p>4.1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>6</p> <p>3.6 3.3.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1.1 1.2.2</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>
--	---	---

		<p>effectively due to derisory number or permits available.</p> <p>There are inadequate transport links to the Village for visitors and employees, two bus links are the only alternative available. This will cause issues with staff as it will be difficult getting into work.</p> <p>One link to a car park in the south of the City is wholly insufficient. There is no car park in Clifton Village and no dedicated link to a car park.</p> <p>Large employees on the periphery of the Village provide daily trade for the retailers and restaurants which is essential to their sustainability. BCC does not recognise the co-dependence in their plans and are in danger of upsetting this fragile community and the economic output of the Village.</p> <p>Clifton is a historical preservation area and does not need any further street clutter that meters, signs and lines would bring.</p> <p>The scheme will not stop people using or getting rid of their cars. They will just drive and shop elsewhere and park stupidly on all side roads where the scheme doesn't exist.</p>	<p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.3 6.1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1. 4.1.3</p>
97		Objects to paragraph 37(1)(c ) which states that no more than one residents' permit may be issued if there is off-street parking at its address. This is unfair to those who have just one allocated private parking space with no capacity for additional vehicles i.e. one marked space and no garage and no right to park in front of a driveway. To make the scheme fair, there should be the same number of spaces for each household, private or otherwise.	3.5.1
98		<p>Even in the middle of the night when the shoppers are absent, there are still very few spaces in Clifton Village. This suggests that all those parking there are residents. The difficult parking situation which exists there today will not only remain, but everyone will have to pay for it.</p> <p>Enquires how extensive an area the permit will cover and if it will only entitle him to park on his own street. Would also like to know where the nearest 24 hour free parking is located if he chooses not to get a permit.</p> <p>Suggests that a one way system around West Mall and Caledonia Place with diagonal parking spaces would increase parking capacity.</p> <p>The general opinion is that the scheme is simply designed to bring money in for the Council.</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
99		As a former resident of Kingsdown they have seen the benefits of the planned RPS. However, they cannot see how it will be positive in Clifton; the Village needs to be kept accessible to commercial visitors and tourists.	1
100		They are extremely concerned at how the parking scheme will affect local businesses, visitors and	1

		also residents. There is nothing wrong with the current system but the parking scheme will kill Clifton.	
101		<p>Objects to the scheme as there is no effective public transport from South Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Asks whether there are any plans to create an access to the upper levels of West End car park from lower Clifton Village. She would be prepared to pay the charges as the prices are reasonable.</p> <p>The proposed parking charges will turn Clifton into a residential area like Cotham and not a village. The only businesses that will be able to survive will be those that directly support the residents e.g. supermarkets.</p> <p>She cannot park outside her house; people accept this when they purchase their properties.</p> <p>The scheme should stop at 6pm, not 9pm and should not include Saturdays. This is less restrictive and off-putting to visitors.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>3.4</p>
102		<p>Fully supports the proposed scheme as the organised opposition to it comes from self-serving local traders who have no concern for the wider community. This unrepresentative minority should not prevent the scheme's introduction.</p> <p>There is efficient and regular public transport to the village for visiting consumers and the one hour parking facilities will be adequate for those consumers wishing to collect their purchases.</p>	Comments noted
103		<p>Objects to the proposals as they will have to pay out large amounts of money whilst relying on their pension and savings to survive.</p> <p>The parking meters are being installed at an enormous cost and do not allow residents to park. It will make it more difficult to park than before and they will be forced to circulate round to find a parking place.</p>	<p>3.1.2</p> <p>4.1.5</p>
104		They currently enjoy shopping in Clifton but this will change if the parking restrictions are brought in.	4.1
105		Objects to the current proposals for Royal York Crescent as at the previous stage of consultation they were given the option of not having double yellow lines outside their garage. If double yellow lines are installed, she would be forced to keep her car in their inadequate space of a Georgian storage vault and will be obliged to force her neighbours to move their bikes and to place their rubbish bins onto the street.	5.5
106		<p>Objects to the scheme as they feel that it is being imposed on Clifton Village.</p> <p>The scheme will have a very bad effect on both residents and businesses in the Clifton Village area.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>2.2</p>

		The Council should listen to the suggestions made put forward by the Clifton Village traders.	
107		<p>Supports the scheme and opposes the ludicrous notices that claim that Clifton will die if it goes ahead. Clifton would actually thrive.</p> <p>The commuters block any access not only to residents but also to shoppers coming into the Village for a few hours.</p> <p>No one wants to shop in Clifton for 8 hours so removing the commuter blocks would actually increase turnover of parking spaces and hence increase business in the Village.</p> <p>The scheme strikes the right balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of local businesses.</p> <p>The one hour parking restrictions should be increased to two or three hours.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>4.2</p>
108		<p>Putting a permits system in place would mean that they would not be able to park outside their work (Bristol Zoo). The maximum stay of five hours would mean she has to leave work half way through the day and try to find an alternative place to park or go home.</p> <p>Using public transport is not an option and driving to Bristol and then catching public transport would be expensive and impractical for their commute.</p>	<p>4.6</p> <p>4.5</p>
109		<p>Objects to the scheme as a one hour maximum stay would not be long enough for her clients. Some hair treatments could last for at least four hours. Her clients would not be able to move their car mid haircut.</p> <p>If she was forced to relocate her business then it could crucially affect the business as half of her clients live in the Village. Some customers travel for 10-20 miles and have no other option than to drive. If they are unable to park in Clifton then she will lose custom. This will also affect other traders in the Village, as her customers spend money keeping other local businesses alive.</p> <p>Permit holders will use the shared use bays, which will prevent customers from using the pay &amp; display facility. There are simply not enough pay &amp; display parking spaces to accommodate the Village businesses. The lack of available parking will result in clients driving around looking for spaces which will either mean they cancel their appointment or cause havoc to her tight schedule.</p> <p>Four businesses operate from one salon but the salon will only be entitled to apply for a total of 7 permits. Asks how the permits will be divided between members of staff.</p> <p>She runs a small business within a large business and will therefore not qualify for small business rate relief; the full cost of the permits is very expensive for a small business.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4</p> <p>4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>3.2.1</p>

		<p>The Salon may reconsider renting the building due to the scheme which will have a knock on effect on the landlord renting the building to them. If businesses are forced to leave Clifton Village then house prices will drop. Residents will not be happy when their Village is empty of shops and cafes.</p> <p>Due to the nature of her work a customer permit may not offer any benefit as she works on multiple clients at one time making it difficult to exchange the permit between customers.</p> <p>The Village works as it is due to the fact that the residents leave the area in the morning and the spaces are taken by commuters. The commuters leave at 5pm leaving spaces for the returning residents.</p> <p>The correct facilities need to be in place before the parking scheme is implemented e.g. not everyone is capable of biking to work and cycling infrastructure is not in place. The Village needs a car park big enough to accommodate all the visitors for the scheme to work. People cannot rely on public transport such as the 8/9 bus service as it is either non-existent or running late. A decent park and ride scheme through Bristol would help.</p> <p>The Village will be full of black ugly pay &amp; display boxes and the streets will be painted an array of colours for parking places with plaques everywhere showing where you can and cannot park, which will be an eyesore.</p> <p>100% of the people voted not to have this scheme in place so it would not be democratic to introduce it.</p>	<p>4.1.3 6.1</p> <p>1.3 4.2 4.6.4</p> <p>1.2.2</p> <p>4.5 4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>2</p>
110		<p>Objects to the scheme as Clifton Village is not a place where shoppers and tourists just want to pop into a shop for a pint of milk. They want to enjoy the atmosphere of the Village and be able to wander around browsing and take in the many shops, cafes and bars.</p> <p>The Council explained that the pay &amp; display is not a proposed income stream but a means of controlling traffic, however the argument does not hold up as if people can only stay for an hour than the number of cars coming in and out the Village will double. It does not mean that trade would double as visitors would be under constant pressure to return to their car.</p> <p>Treatments at their own business take an hour to complete and consequently some of the older ladies that use the salon and are not able to walk too far will no longer be able to come because of the distance they will have to walk from their car.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>4.2</p>
111		<p>Is in general agreement with introducing a scheme to cut down on commuter parking.</p> <p>Objects to the specific proposal for Royal York Crescent as it removes the parking on the north side. It is already difficult to park in the evenings and this will make it impossible. Each house has four or five flats and there will not be enough spaces to cater for them.</p>	<p>5.5</p>

112	Requests the removal of double yellow lines outside the adjacent garages owned by	5.5	
	The proposals will make it much harder for them to park close to where they live. Has already requested that double yellow lines are not placed in front of the two garages belonging to residents of number 16 in the hope that this will provide a parking space. If this were done along the length of the Crescent, it would help to alleviate the problem.	5.5	
113	Needs to take her child to nursery by car each day and travels to meetings around the southwest so will arrive and leave Clifton at different times. Her company will not cover parking charges and they are unaffordable. The scheme may cause her to give up her job.	4.1.4	
114	Concerned about the impact of the scheme on local businesses. There are too many one hour maximum stay bays, with the remainder of the parking bays being for residents only. People want to drive to Clifton and spend time there so more long-stay parking is needed. The proposal has not taken into account that residents enjoy living in Clifton because of the businesses.	4.2	
	Clifton High School needs to be able to apply for more permits as it is an asset to the area and their teachers need somewhere to park.	4.3	
	There are many residents without cars at present who are proposing to buy one when the scheme comes in. This has not been taken into account.	1.2	
115	The plans do not show where the ticket machines and signs will go. This is an important part of the impact of the scheme so should be made clear.	4.1.5	
	They cannot access their off street parking unless there is no car parked on the other side of Cobblestone Mews so that should have double yellow lines. Cobblestone Mews is a proposed permit parking area. This will potentially obstruct access to every off street parking space. This could make their off street parking unusable.	5.18	
	They are restricted to one permit holder but are a household of four drivers. If they cannot agree who the permit holder should be, how will this be decided?	3.5.3	
	As they can only have one permit then only one car can be parked in Clifton. If they had no off street parking they could have two or three permits. This is restricting the freedom of movement of two family members and will impact on their independence and ability to earn a living. This is a breach of article 8 of the Human Rights Act.	3.5.1 3.5.4	
116	Strongly object as a resident of Clifton. The scheme is unfair and an additional tax. Residents and businesses pay enough already.	3.1.1	
117	The restriction to one permit for properties with off-street parking is in contravention of Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 because:	3.5.4	

	<p>1. It restricts personal autonomy within the family environment;  2. It restricts the right to enjoy family life by failing to take into account the nature and size of the family home;  3. It restricts the right to enjoy family life by denying some adult members of the household the opportunity to own or operate their own vehicle.</p> <p>The proposal does not specify who should be the permit holder, which denies other household members the right of appeal. This infringes the Equalities Act, the Human Rights Acts, the Disabilities Acts and other legislation.</p> <p>The Order does not define 'off-street parking' so no permit restrictions can be imposed. They must be defined as private areas capable of parking a vehicle of typical size with freely available access.</p> <p>Second set of objections submitted:  1. Cobblestone Mews is proposed as a PPA with no protection for garages or access to off street parking facilities. In most cases. Access is only possible if there are double yellow lines opposite the access. Requests to know why their access has not been protected and that it is now added to the plan. Requests that double yellow lines be added across the rear of his property and on the opposite side of the carriageway. This should be offered to every other garage owner.  2. There should be provision for households with off-street parking to apply for more than one permit.  3. The one permit policy is unfair to families with larger homes as it prevents each person from having their own vehicle. This discriminates against those whose culture includes the principle of many generations living together.  4. No information is given on the location of signs and pay &amp; display machines.  5. Worcester Terrace is likely to be swamped with vehicles displaced from Clifton Village in the evening. Would like options to extend their times to Monday to Saturday 9-9.  This scheme has been comprehensively rejected previously. There is no democratic mandate for it.</p>	<p>3.5.3</p> <p>3.5.1</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>3.5 3.5</p> <p>4.1.5 3.4.1</p> <p>1</p>
118	<p>The proposed one hour maximum stay does not allow any time for leisure activities. Three hours throughout the scheme area would be acceptable as this would enable people to wander round the Village, go to the shops, have lunch, etc. The one hour restriction will stop people from coming to the Village. It will create a ghost town and will be detrimental to the efforts being made to build a sustainable, thriving community. This will have an adverse impact on Bristol's reputation as a major tourist destination.</p>	4.2
119	<p>Restricting some parking bays to a one hour maximum stay will impair the ability of businesses to trade and shows a lack of understanding of how an integrated community functions.</p>	4.2
120	<p>Owns a business in Clifton Village employing 11 staff. Business interests need to be considered. Some staff commute from Somerset and Gloucester so cannot travel by public transport. The proposed permit allocation of 7 per business is very limited. The landlord of the building is only entitled to three permits, so their company will not get any.</p>	4.3

		Employees and customers use the shops and restaurants too, not just the residents.	4.1.3
		Concerned that the pay & display parking does not start until 9am as many people arrive for work before then. Requests clarification on where they can park before 9am.	3.4.2
121		The removal of parking along one side of Royal York Crescent means a loss of 30 parking spaces, leaving 75-80 spaces for 50 houses, many of which contain five flats. The current system works whereas the proposals will severely disrupt the lives of residents.	5.5
122		The cost of the third permit is more than double the cost of the first permit. This is unfair to single professionals sharing a household. Many single professionals share houses but work in separate places, often outside the city where there are no public transport links. The permit prices should be equal and not greater than the cost of running the scheme.	3.1.2
		The limit of one permit to households with off-street parking is unfair to those with one allocated parking space and no garage or driveway that they could park across. Each household should be able to apply for the same number of permits.	3.5
123		Object to any change that makes parking more difficult for them and their carers. They are a disabled couple and have various carers on a regular basis each day. They particularly need a permit for their carer who comes every morning for three hours.	3.7
124		The scheme will cause major inconvenience to residents arriving home at the end of the day. They will have paid to park but will be unable to do so because of evening visitors.	3.3
		Their main concern is the danger to the retail businesses. Parking restrictions will turn Clifton into a ghost town with more pubs and bars but fewer shops.	4.1
125		Objects on behalf of 30 colleagues at Taxi Studio. The scheme is ill thought out and will be detrimental to business. The majority of staff travel there from far afield and will not be able to park or access convenient and regular public transport. The scheme will kill the Village, its essence and the businesses within it.	4.4
126		Almost half of their staff that drive to work, who will need to because public transport is inadequate and parking too expensive, may need to look for another job. Clifton Village will lose its atmosphere as the parking charges will put people off visiting.	4.5



127		<p>One hour is not enough time to shop, have coffee or go to the hairdressers. This will affect businesses and the way of life and atmosphere in the Village.</p> <p>Has two children that attend school in the area. Waiting for both children can take 45-60 minutes and objects to having to pay to park. There will be insufficient parking near Clifton Lawn Tennis Club.</p> <p>The scheme will have an impact on Leigh Woods as there has been a big increase in commuters parking here in recent years. Cheap and effective modes of transport should be introduced first.</p> <p>Further consultation is needed before any scheme is implemented to look at the hours and the effect on neighbouring areas.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>2.2</p>
128		The proposals have not considered the economic impact on the local area as it could reduce the viability of retailers. It would reduce the quality of the village atmosphere and if the village does survive the problem will be pushed to other areas. There is a parking problem but there must be better ways of dealing with it.	1
129		The parking restrictions would make it no longer worthwhile to visit Clifton with reduced parking times and the cost of parking. The scheme seems intended to make money and does not consider visitors to Clifton or its small independent businesses.	4.1.1
130		<p>Does not object to the scheme in principle.</p> <p>The proposal to limit parking to one hour is very draconian as it will prevent people from stopping for lunch and shopping. Businesses and the atmosphere of the Village will suffer. A two hour limit would be much better.</p>	4.2
131		The businesses and people of Clifton do not want the current proposals so they should be stopped.	1.2 2
132		The proposals will kill the businesses in Clifton.	4
133		They see 80-100 patients each day, many of whom arrive by car. A one hour maximum stay is totally unacceptable as appointments often take that long. The plans show very few pay & display spaces anyway. This is an essential service for the area and many patients stay in the area after their appointment and spend money in the local businesses. If people stop coming here local	4.2

		businesses will not survive.	
134		<p>The proposals will have a significant impact on trade and businesses.</p> <p>Leigh Woods will become a car park for commuters to Clifton, which is unacceptable.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>5.2</p>
135		The current arrangements work perfectly well for shoppers and business owners, so should not be changed.	1.2
136		<p>Drives in from Wells and parks on local streets as the public transport alternatives would take three hours each way. The proposal will make it difficult for him to stay in his job.</p> <p>The restrictions are a tax on residents and a tax on employment in the area. The green agenda is being used as a pretext for raising money.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
137		Does not want any parking restrictions introduced as they are not necessary and will stop people from visiting the area. Visitors make a valuable contribution to the local economy.	1.2
138		Clifton residents are united in opposition to the scheme. It will stifle business by stopping people visiting and residents will be paying for fewer places to park.	<p>1</p> <p>3.3</p>
139		<p>Deeply concerned about the negative impact the scheme will have on the economic and social balance of Clifton and the city as a whole. Travelling by car in Bristol is still much quicker than cycling or public transport. The one hour time limit is totally inadequate. Public transport is inadequate, with no light rail system or anything else in place.</p> <p>The system is unfair. Residents' of an area do not have more right to park there than everyone else.</p> <p>There is not a parking problem. Commutes and parks in Cliftonwood every day and has never found it a problem parking.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.2</p>
140		<p>The proposal includes a parking bay opposite the entrance to our property. If this is to be installed it will be very difficult to enter and exit their off-street parking facilities. The owner of number 3 would not be able to use their facility at all.</p> <p>Double yellow lines should be extended from the four garages opposite to just short of Mansion House Stables entrance.</p>	5.12
141		Small independent businesses thrive on passing trade. The proposals will deter the 'spur of the moment' shoppers who make up the majority of passing trade.	4.1

142		<p>Objects to the double yellow lines outside garages. The 50+ displaced cars will make it much harder to park. Her disabled mother has to get to hospital appointments and finds it very difficult to get to and from her wheelchair to her home at number 18. She does her shopping twice a week and needs to make two trips to her home.</p> <p>Objects to the whole parking scheme as there is clearly not enough space to park.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>3.3</p>
143		<p>Travels from Weston-super-Mare each day. Joined the 2Share car share scheme and drives 3 other people to work at Bristol University. This helps to make the city less congested but now she will have to pay for parking. This will cost over £2,000 a year and involve moving the car due to the five hour limit.</p> <p>This will also have an impact on the business as people will be less likely to have time to look at the window display.</p> <p>There is no public car park in the area and she already has to arrive at 8am to find a parking space.</p>	<p>4.6</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.6</p>
144		<p>The current arrangement provides flexibility for visitors to residents and to shops and businesses. The proposal could be detrimental to the atmosphere of Clifton and could drive businesses and visitors away.</p>	4.1
145		<p>Objects to the proposals as they will have a negative impact on the area.</p>	1.4
146		<p>One hour parking will stop people from coming for lunch or having their hair done and will ruin the small businesses.</p>	4.2
147		<p>Director of a company employing 40+ staff. It is likely that they will relocate as key members of staff rely on driving in and there is no alternative parking available.</p>	4.6
148		<p>Commutes from Street in Somerset each day and is concerned about the inadequate transport links into the Village. 20 employees commute each day. With limited business permits they will lose key staff members and the business may fold.</p>	4.4

		<p>We are hugely concerned that the ability to attract and retain talent when the proposed RPS comes into force will be compromised as commuting into Bristol will no longer be a viable option for many of these members of staff.</p> <p>Local businesses provide daily trade for Clifton retailers and restaurants which is paramount to their sustainability. The scheme puts Clifton in danger of upsetting this fragile community and ultimately the economic output of the village.</p> <p>7 permits (and no off street parking) are not sufficient for us to continue to trade out of Clifton. The number of business permits is too low to enable businesses to complete their operations effectively and for employees who have no alternative way to get to work. With inadequate transport links into Clifton we are concerned these employees will seek alternative employment, which is extremely detrimental to the future of our business. Clifton does not have a car park, needs better transport links. The 2 bus services into the Village are not sufficient. Better transport links need to in place before implementation of RPS in Clifton.</p> <p>The Clifton Village RPS process was fast tracked by the BCC and we missed a vital consultation phase which would have resulted in plans being better informed and more equitable.</p>	<p>4.3 4.4 4.6 4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.3 1.3</p> <p>4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p>
149		<p>Strongly objects as residents and businesses do now want it. It is intended to make money and should not go ahead.</p>	1
150		<p>They occupy floors 2, 3 and 4 of the building and have 75 desk spaces which are fully occupied with freelance and short term contract employees. They have five off street parking spaces for the Executives. Office hours are 0830-1830 Monday to Friday but people often work evenings and weekends. Employees come from as far as Portishead and Downend in Bristol with some commuting from Somerset and Wiltshire.</p> <p>They encourage sustainable commuting and run incentive schemes such as cycle to work schemes but they are not suitable for everyone. Employees currently suffer with public transport, especially those that have to get home at certain times for childcare. There are inadequate transport links to support their employees who travel at all hours, there is no car park or direct link to one and it would not be safe to walk to the nearest car park at night.</p> <p>The number of business permits available is far too low to enable the business to operate safely and effectively. Many of their employees have to travel to work by car and have no alternative. Pay and display parking of one to four hours is not sufficient for their operating times.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4</p> <p>4</p>

151	<p>Clifton's RPS will have higher charges and more restrictive times than other areas.</p> <p>Friends and family will be less inclined to visit so she will become more isolated.</p> <p>She will need to give up hobbies that require the use of a car, e.g. community choir that rehearses in Southville, as it will be difficult to find a parking space when she gets home.</p> <p>Does not want Clifton to become empty with shops and restaurants closing which will then have an impact on property values.</p>	<p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.1</p>
152	<p>The scheme will force them to move their business elsewhere. They have one parking space that they pay for. They have nine staff and the other eight park on nearby streets. The director will not pay for an additional eight permits.</p> <p>The company contributes to the economic wealth of the Village. Lunchtime trade in local eateries comes from staff working nearby so these businesses will suffer. The independent shops and restaurants will slowly close down.</p> <p>Currently the residential areas are empty in the morning as the vast majority of residents drive to work. There is no logic in having empty parking spaces.</p>	<p>4.6</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>1.2</p>
153	<p>Has lived in Leigh Woods for four years and is a motorist and cyclist. Fully supports the proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Requests that they be accompanied by increased cycle rack provision throughout the city. It is sometimes impossible to find somewhere to lock up a bike and cyclists are forced to lock them to fences and railings, which is unsightly and inconvenient.</p>	<p>5.1</p>
154	<p>Set up her business a year ago and chose the Village because of the number of bustling shops. Was not looking forward to the individual parking challenge of finding a space each day but still felt it to be the best location for her business. The shop that she rented had previously been empty for two years, which was not good for the area. The shop does not rely on passing trade, it relies on people pottering and browsing. The aim is for them to continue to visit and to recommend the shop to others. However, now people will be charged to come just for an hour. This will put them off.</p> <p>A year ago she was meeting a friend for lunch in Clifton Village. She was trying to find a parking space when her friend phoned and said she had been trying for an hour and was too stressed to carry on looking so they went elsewhere. Many people probably do this. The Council should be doing all it can to enable the Village to continue to thrive. There is not enough parking already and now much of it will be turned into permit parking only. Lack of on-street parking is already a major problem and this will make it worse.</p> <p>Residents who own property in Clifton know there is no parking so they will walk to cafes, restaurants, bars and shops and will leave their car at home.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1.2</p>

		<p>The parking scheme risks turning Clifton Village into a ghost town. It should be re-considered or delayed until alternative parking is provided.</p> <p>The council should not be taking away spaces until it has built a multi-storey or underground car park in the village.</p> <p>Businesses in Clifton will shut down. Shop owners will be forced to shut as people start to go elsewhere to shop.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.1</p>
155		<p>Works in Clifton and relies on her car to travel to and from work. If viable public transport links existed the scheme might have some merit.</p> <p>There is no clear mandate to make these changes.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>2.2</p>
156		<p>Parks in the area as works nearby. Car shares on 50% of journeys but drives because there is no viable public transport link. Park &amp; Ride schemes serve the city centre but not the Village and are expensive. Could catch a train to Temple Meads but there are few trains to Clifton Down and few buses.</p> <p>The scheme will result in far fewer people visiting the city and using its shops and services. People will not want to work here and the city will be drained of its talent, culture and life.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
157		<p>Strongly supports the introduction of residents' parking in the local area as Clifton is currently a free car park for commuters.</p> <p>Does not support the one hour time limit. The local centre builds community spirit, provides basic facilities and is an important attraction for visitors to the city. The one hour restriction could seriously undermine the area's sustainability. Requests that the one hour time limit is extended to at least two hours.</p>	<p>4.2</p>
158		<p>Works 9-6 five days a week in Clifton. There is no direct commute to work by public transport. Does not want to walk or cycle as it is too dangerous and there is no direct bus service. Clifton has very little transport infrastructure and this will alienate people living outside the city.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
159		<p>1. The cost of residents' permits should be no higher than in Cotham.</p> <p>2. One hour maximum stays should be increased to at least two hours to ensure the viability of shops and businesses.</p> <p>3. The north part of the scheme will become a free car park on Saturdays. Residents will be paying to park during the week, when there is no significant problem, and will gain no benefit on Saturdays. Parking restrictions should apply across the whole area on Saturdays.</p>	<p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p>

		4. Clifton Park Road should be a one way street with cars only able to enter from the south end. The south end of the road is too narrow for emergency vehicles and refuse collectors to gain access if cars are parked on both sides. Parking should only be permitted on the western side and should be residents only Monday to Saturday with drop off areas for the school and swimming pool.	5.1
160		Objects to the scheme in its current form. Would prefer a scheme similar to the existing areas. The current proposal for Clifton seems unfair and expensive.	3.1.4
161		The plans show their vehicular access onto Grange Road as unprotected. Requests that double yellow lines be added to ensure permanent access in and out of their gate.	5.2
162		Has previously lived in London and Southampton and found the permit parking schemes in those cities to be inconvenient. Has had minimal problems parking and usually finds a space within 30 seconds walk. It would be better to use the space across the gorge for commuters and to leave Clifton as it is.	1
163		Is disgusted by the proposals around St Pauls Road and the Village. The proposal should be amended to Monday to Friday to keep the Village busy at weekends.	3.4
164		The scheme is unworkable given the number of flats and the cost. It will not benefit the area. Clifton has a higher percentage of flats than houses. It is already difficult to find a parking space after 9pm.	3.3
		The scheme will reduce the amount of space available for parking due to its layout.	4.2
		The scheme will decimate the local economy – the one hour allowance is not enough. Businesses will not keep running with reduced trade. Businesses should not be charged more for parking; this is an extra tax on hard working independent businesses.	3.1.4
		The higher pricing for Clifton is discrimination.	3.1.4
		The scheme in Clifton will run until 9pm, if the idea is to stop commuters taking spaces then surely 10 am to 4pm is a better period. The proposals will stop friends and family from visiting.	3.4
165		Strongly supports the scheme. It is needed to prevent car commuting and encourage public transport use.	
		Requests that a sufficient number of visitor parking permits are made available at a reasonable price and that there is a cheap/free bus service to enable people to visit Clifton at weekends.	3.6
166		Generally in favour of residential parking but cannot support this scheme.	
		The proposals will seriously compromise the viability of Clifton traders and the Village as a whole. It	4

	has not been thought through. Public transport links to the Village are poor and there are no off-street car park solutions.	
167	Has lived in Worcester Terrace for a year without any parking problems. Does not want to start paying for something that is currently free and which is unnecessary.	1
168	Strongly supports the introduction of the RPS.  Requests that the double yellow line be extended for 6 metres on the north side of the entrance to the Fosseway as it is very narrow and even badly parked small vehicles cause access problems.	5.9
169	Objects to the proposals as they will have a strong negative impact on businesses and cafes. Objects to the proposed 9am to 9pm restriction in Caledonia Place. This makes it impossible for friends and family to visit in the evening without a parking pass.  It seems we will only be given the same number of passes as residents whose restrictions will end at 5pm. Are we meant to have no family or friends before 9pm. Extremely unreasonable.	3.4  3.6
170	Confirms that the proposed parking bay opposite numbers 2 and 3 will prevent the use of the off-street parking belonging to number 3. Requests that this be replaced with double yellow lines. The overall parking provision will be unaffected as they will be able to park off-street rather than on the street because they cannot use their off-street space.	5.12
171	The 9-9 scheme should be extended to give residents ease of access to their houses. Those with off-street parking are objecting but they are a minority with the rest of the residents finding it difficult to park in the evenings.	3.4
172	Requests that the plans be amended to show that the end of Boyces Avenue beyond the existing double yellow lines is a privately owned access road and the area under the arch belongs to Arch House Ltd.  The cafes and restaurants in the village employ over 1000 people, most of which cannot afford to live in the village. They have to work late shifts and therefore public transport home is not an option. Women walking late at night feel vulnerable. The only alternative will be a taxi which is too expensive on waiter wages.	5.13  4.4
173	Usually parks on the street when working at litfield House. There are usually plenty of parking spaces available. The scheme will force him to take his business elsewhere, which will have a negative impact on his patients and on other staff. His patients are people who have been in serious accidents and require assistance to get back on their feet. If the service is not available this will cause them serious problems.	4



174		Objects to the proposals in support of local businesses that make the area what it is today. A maximum stay of one hour will not benefit Clifton.	4.2
175		Unhappy at the prospect of more parking restrictions.	1
176		Does not support residents' parking in Clifton. Is not a resident but a regular shopper and diner. If the scheme is brought in she would not visit as often as she does now.	4.1
177		Metered short stay parking will be bad for businesses as they will lose custom. Residents within the area will have to pay unjust permit prices Residents outside but close to the area, including him, will have increased parking problems. If the scheme goes ahead, people will spill into the surrounding area and people seeking to avoid second and third permit fees will leave them on the edge of the area.	4 3.2 5.2
178		The proposals will be bad for local businesses and will make it inconvenient and expensive for his girlfriend to visit. It will not reduce the number of residents' cars, it will only generate revenue.	3.6
179		Works in a hairdressing salon as a self-employed hairdresser renting a chair. The scheme will make him lose his job. Most businesses in the Village rely on people having time to wander around and many of his clients are in the salon for several hours.  The parking in the Village should be left as it is. One hour is insufficient for any business to survive. The number of available spaces will be greatly reduced. Permit holders will not be able to find a space so they will park in the pay & display, further reducing the space for customers.	4.2  4.2
180		The plans are confusing and too complicated.  Visitors' permits should be more generous.  Enquires whether parking charges can be paid by phone as this would be very useful and simpler.  Here are no parking problems in the summer when students are not here. It would be better to delay the project until after the summer to test this theory and identify ways of preventing students from bringing cars here.	2  3.6 4.1.5 1
181		The proposals are not logical, helpful, necessary or democratic.	1

182		Does not understand why the current situation needs changing. The time that people are allowed to park for should not be changed and charges should not be introduced.	1
183		The proposals will cause many businesses to fail and close down. The Council will lose revenue when the loss of business rates is taken into account against parking charges. This is irresponsible and irreversible.	4
184		The proposal has been poorly thought out and does not take Clifton's unique identity into account. The scheme will destroy Clifton and should not be railroaded through. The wishes of the people that work and live here must be listened to.	1
185		Agrees that something needs to be done to prevent commuter parking clogging up the streets but this is another tax and it is not fair that Clifton residents should pay.	3.1
		It will adversely affect businesses. Mixed permit holder and 2 hour visitor parking with no meters throughout the area should be introduced instead.	4
		Asks whether it is a money making ruse.	3.1
186		This is an imposition on a community that does not require it and did not request it.	1.2
		It will be detrimental to business, which threatens jobs and will ruin the neighbourhood. It could also discourage visitors.	4
		There is no good reason to implement it and no mandate.	1
187		Objects to the scheme because it is fundamentally unreasonable. Visitors will not be able to park until after 9pm and are only eligible for 60 free visitors permits. Asking them to park in a car park in the evenings is inappropriate for vulnerable or elderly visitors who will have to walk quite far past pubs and clubs. Asks what trades people will do if visitor permits are used by friends and family.	3.6 3.9
188		The scheme was announced as being intended to benefit residents but this will not be the case. Residents are being forced to fund something they don't want.	1.2
		All of the shops are concerned for their livelihood and residents have been vocal in their opposition. It will create a village of empty shops where people have to pay to see their friends in the evening.	4.1
		A four hour scheme would be enough to keep out commuters.	4.2

		The scheme should at least be restricted to Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.00pm.	3.4
189		<p>1. It is most difficult to park late in the evening, which cannot be a result of commuter traffic. The proposals will reduce the amount of space available to residents and make this worse.</p> <p>2. These measures are said to be intended to encourage sustainable commuting. He travels to work by bike and will now have to pay to do so by buying a residents' permit. This is not an incentive to be sustainable.</p> <p>3. Has experienced parking schemes in European cities and as a result has spent less time and money there. Bristol should think of a better solution.</p> <p>Signs in Clifton indicate parking meters will be installed on 1<sup>st</sup> May so this is clearly not democratic.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>2.2.3</p>
190		<p>Finds it much easier to get around in Bristol than in other cities and likes that the parking arrangements are simple. Parking permits will ruin Clifton. It seems intended to make money as it will not benefit residents.</p> <p>Part of Clifton's appeal is that you can park for an hour for free in shopping areas and can park for free in residential streets. This plan should not proceed as it will stop Bristol from being the laidback, friendly city it is.</p>	<p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.2</p>
191		<p>Does not have a parking problem at the moment.</p> <p>Clifton will lose business if parking charges are introduced.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>4.1</p>
192		<p>It is a burden that elderly residents would have to pay each time helpers, carers and concerned relatives visit.</p> <p>The scheme will harm the viability of local shops and should enable 2 hour or longer parking.</p>	<p>3.7</p> <p>4.2</p>
193		Clifton is a vibrant local centre. The scheme will harm local businesses and the whole community.	4.1
194		The scheme will stop people visiting Clifton and will impact on our shops and people working here. This will have a detrimental effect on the whole area.	4.1
195		Clifton thrives upon its small businesses and the proposal will threaten their viability which will have a negative impact on the whole community and will stop visitors from coming to Clifton.	4.1

196	<p>Objects to the limited amount of parking for visitors to the Village. A one hour time slot is not enough to visit the shops or look at the Suspension Bridge.</p> <p>Local buses do not run on time – has waited up to 40 minutes for an 8/9 to arrive and it is not due to congestion.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.5</p>
197	<p>Regularly visits Clifton Village to browse and have coffee; has a child who attends dance school in Clifton. The parking scheme would mean they could no longer afford this if they have to pay to park. They run a small business and have opposed residents' parking in their own area. The schemes hurt businesses, home workers, families and communities.</p> <p>Suggests charging people with lots of cars per household instead. The only resident she knows that supports it does so because their neighbour parks 5 cars on the road.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>3.1</p>
198	<p>1. Is generally in favour of the scheme but the hours should be Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm. Clifton is a weekend destination for shoppers and walkers and a Saturday restriction is unhelpful.</p> <p>2. Different permit prices for different cars is petty as no-one will change cars because of it.</p> <p>3. Pay &amp; display machines should have a 15 or 30 minute free period.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>4.2.5</p>
199	<p>. It is too far to cycle or walk and public transport is inadequate. There is no public car park or park &amp; ride nearby.</p> <p>It takes around 1.5 hours to get to work by bus, compared to 15-20 minutes by car. Public transport is not an acceptable option, particularly as it will also cost £66 a month. Public transport is not good enough to support the introduction of these proposals.</p> <p>Even if she were happy to pay to park, there would be nowhere to leave the car. Sometimes needs the car during the day for meetings and also needs it after work so it is not convenient to go home first.</p> <p>Her employer cannot provide enough permits for everyone. She will not be able to apply for a permit as an individual.</p> <p>Paying at a meter would cost £160 a month or £80 with a car sharer. This is unaffordable and would certainly mean it would be impossible to support local shops by buying lunch etc.</p> <p>States that the cycle journey of 7 miles would be to greater distance and through dangerous neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Objects to the high cost of public transport in Bristol and the lack of public transport infrastructure in Clifton Village itself.</p> <p>It is currently possible to find somewhere to park on most streets, which demonstrates that the</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.2</p>

		<p>scheme is not needed.</p> <p>Says the scheme should not go ahead because it does not have an evidence base to support its need. It does not follow national planning policy (see paragraph 17 of NPPF).</p>	1
200		Rents an apartment in the Mall. It is not clear from the plans whether it will be possible to park there after 5.00pm or not, or whether it will be possible to park in other streets.	3.4
201		Is in favour of the new parking scheme as Clifton has too many shoppers' cars in it.	
202		<p>Objects to the proposed pay &amp; display outside 6 Gordon Road as TRO 1340 has just been implemented on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2014 after it was sealed on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2013. This allows parents to pick up and drop off children with a maximum stay of 15 minutes. This TRO was part of the planning permission for the nursery.</p> <p>The proposal of pay &amp; display outside 6 Gordon Road with a maximum stay of one hour during the day and three hours during the evening with 30 minutes free parking is a concern for the nursery because other people will now use the spaces for shopping on Whiteladies Road.</p> <p>The scheme does not start operation until 9am but the nursery and the current restrictions start at 8:30am.</p>	5.16
203		<p>Has lived in Clifton for 24 years. Feels a parking scheme is not necessary because they all knew about the parking situation when they moved in. If the parking regime changes, businesses will fail or move elsewhere. Objects to the scheme because there is an absence of robust evidence base underpinning the need for a scheme.</p> <p>EEF LTD is based at Engineers House on Clifton Down Road and employs over 40 staff. Has developed a travel plan.</p> <p>The impact of the proposals will be negative on the venue and professional services where flexible business related travel is critical to the modus operandi.</p> <p>The mechanism by which permits are issued and managed, including but not limited to the proposed time limit restrictions sought and inadequate arrangements for non-residents business parking in the area.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>4.3.2</p> <p>4.3.2</p> <p>4.3</p>
204		Driving is the only option for getting to work. Parking restrictions may force her to look for alternative employment. Trains from Lawrence Hill station to Clifton Down are not frequent enough so she would arrive at work 45 minutes early and stay 45 minutes late. Catching the bus involves walking to the bus stop, catching a bus, walking across the city centre and then across Clifton. The current journey time is only 15 minutes. The frequency of trains needs to be addressed and viable alternatives introduced before the scheme is implemented.	4.6

		Her employer will not be able to apply for permits for all their staff.	4.3
205		Works on Whiteladies Road. Owns a car with low emissions so does not pay road tax but now cannot park it. Is not fit enough to cycle and the current public transport option would mean catching four buses a day. Would use the Park & Ride if it came close to work.	4.4
		If workers can no longer park then customers will not be able to. There is not enough time allowed in the parking bays for shopping and lunch.	4.1.3
206		Objects to the scheme because RPSs are for residential areas but Clifton Village is a retail, leisure and commercial area. Clifton Village is a destination and all businesses help to support the economy. There is not frequent and reliable public transport so most people travel to the area by car when they visit. Many of the businesses will not survive if the RPS goes ahead.	4
		Why should Clifton Village be 9am-9pm instead of 9am-5pm like other areas?	3.4
		Why are the permits more expensive than in other areas?	3.1.4
		One hour parking is not enough for visitors to do everything they might like to do.	4.2
		There should be more spaces dedicated to employees and visitors during the day when the residents' are out at work.	1.1 3.3.2
		Why aren't better public transport links being put in place before the RPS comes in?	4.5
207		Commutes from south Wales and car-shares most days, making 7 journeys into Clifton a week between 3 people. Anticipates seeking alternative employment once the scheme comes in.	4.4
		Public transport links should be better. Driving to Long Ashton and using the new 505 service would take an extra 30 minutes each way and would not reduce car journeys. Other options would also take longer. It is not feasible to carry 3 bikes and cycle the last part of the journey. There is no long-stay parking within a reasonable distance of Clifton Village.	4.5
		His employer has around 70 staff and will not be able to provide all of them with permits. This is unfair as many staff live too far away to walk/cycle or their health makes it unviable. It is unfair to offer more permits to businesses with a bigger frontage. It should be based on parking availability in the whole area rather than outside one building.	4.6
208		The proposal will do more harm than good. It assumes that everyone can walk or cycle to their destination but many people can't.	1
		Does not want double yellow lines across their driveway.	5.11
209		Asks why the Council is steam rolling ahead with the proposal. The news is full of stories of villages dying due to parking restrictions.	1

		No-one will come to the Village if they can only park for one hour. This will not benefit small businesses.	4.2
210		<p>Supports the scheme. Clifton is unique because it attracts as many visitors as there are residents. The businesses are divided between those which cater for residents and those which cater for visitors.</p> <p>Some businesses are essential for residents, e.g. supermarkets, hardware store, greengrocers, and the needs for residents to park and their customers mostly walk there. If businesses are catering for people from outside the Village, then the needs of residents to park close to where they live should be prioritised above the business need.</p> <p>There are also many commuters who park in Clifton but do not work there. They contribute nothing other than adding to the parking problems.</p> <p>Things cannot stay as they are. Supports the vision and good intentions of the proposals to make Clifton a better and fairer place for its resident motorists.</p> <p>Thinks that residents only parking in most of Victoria Square will only strengthen the sense of community, instead of complete strangers always coming and going. The scheme will reaffirm that Clifton is a neighbourly city suburb, not a just a shopping district. Thinks the majority of residents' are yearning for it.</p>	Comments noted
211		Clifton is a unique place with lots of individual shops and it would be a shame if those shops disappeared.	4.1
212		<p>Objects to the revised plan which proposes pay &amp; display only parking on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road when the initial proposal was shared use.</p> <p>Supports the idea of the scheme which is to discourage commuters for parking for free on the streets rather than using the park and ride facilities. However it is unfair to restrict the spaces which were previously available to residents.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>3.3.</p>
213		<p>Commutes by car each day to her job on Whiteladies Road. There is always space available and enough at the end of the day for residents returning home.</p> <p>Works four days a week and spends money in Clifton's gift shops and coffee shops – would use a</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p>

		supermarket instead if her job were not in Clifton.	
		Agrees that something needs to be done about congestion but all this will do is discourage visitors to the shops, particularly as they can only stay for one hour.	4.2
		These measures will not ease congestion as people will park somewhere else and walk. Better alternatives should be provided before the scheme is introduced.	1
214		Gloucester Street is not a suitable road for a PPA, as it is too narrow for parking on both sides of the road without pavement parking taking place. This is why a single yellow line was introduced.	5.15
		There is now a car park at the far end of Gloucester street for Bridge House. This has virtually made Gloucester Street a no through road and has made the situation much worse than it was before.	
		Most of the properties on the south side of the street are rented so it will not be possible for residents to police the PPA themselves. The PPA needs to be reconsidered.	
215		Can understand that residents will need to buy a permit but cannot understand why visitors are being so badly penalised. The scheme will kill off the traders and destroy Clifton.	4.1
216		The scheme will damage the area with loss of business due to people not being able to park without a permit.	4.1
217		Requests not to have double yellow lines across her driveway.	5.4
218		Their company are not allowed any parking permits despite having 25 staff, the majority of whom drive to work. Businesses must be able to buy permits, otherwise they will move away.	4.3
		Public transport links are inadequate. Her commute would be extended by 45 minutes each way and she would have to reduce her working hours as she needs to return to Newport by 3.15pm to collect her son from school. Alternative transport options that are available are not reliable. As they are not guaranteed to run on time. She could get to Portway Park & Ride or Temple Meads railway station but the links to Clifton are not good.	4.5
		As she would need to reduce her hours she would have no time to shop in Clifton at lunchtime.	4.1.3
219		The scheme will have a negative impact on tourism, business and quality of life. It will affect her personally as she is a student who occasionally brings her car to Clifton and cannot afford a permit.	1



220		Works in Clifton and is disabled, so the scheme will make life difficult.	4.2.6
221		An undemocratic decision must not be allowed to be made in the face of huge objection. It will destroy Clifton.	2
222		The proposals will not relieve current parking problems.	1
		Does want double yellow lines across their rear access which opens on opposite number	5.11
223		Does not understand how the scheme will benefit the area and those affected by it.	1
		Businesses will fail or relocate because their staff will have to leave and customers won't come to Clifton if they have to pay to park.	4.1
224		Lives in Portishead and works in Clifton. There is a lack of viable public transport options to get to work. Most journeys involve going to central Bristol to connect with another service.	4.5
		Car share arrangements are not available as his working pattern does not align with other people's.	4.6
		Hopes new park and ride service is up and running before scheme starts. Have you taken into consideration that or a majority of residents in the Portishead/Gordano/Clevedon gateway this would actually increase our travel distances in personal transport with the additional journey by Park and Ride having detrimental impacts.	4.5.2
		As you have not considered in detail the impacts upon everyone affected, and seem not to be taking into account the public consultation exercise, you must cancel the proposed RPS.	2.2.3
225		The proposed removal of parking space on the terrace side will mean an enormous loss of parking	5.5

	<p>opportunities for local residents. The current arrangement works well and parking on both sides encourages drivers to slow down to let each other pass.</p> <p>Other roads of a similar width have parking on both sides. There are spaces between the garages that could be used and these should be put back.</p> <p>The one hour rule for visitors should be reconsidered as it cannot be good for local businesses, particularly hairdressers and restaurants.</p> <p>Had previously supported the idea of a scheme but this is too draconian and invasive. Other areas have the benefit of off-street car parks, such as the one at Sainsburys at Clifton Down which is used by visitors to Cotham Hill.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.6</p>
226	<p>The decision to impose this scheme serves no purpose. Shops, cafes and restaurants will be severely affected because people will not pay for parking.</p> <p>If the scheme goes ahead it will destroy the Village.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.1</p>
227	<p>Has been running a café in Clifton Village for 8 months. They are concerned that residents' parking and the one hour pay &amp; display will seriously damage their business. They fear that one hour will not be long enough for people to visit their café by the time they have found a parking space and walked there and back.</p> <p>The café does not have a takeaway market, it attracts people who are taking a leisurely break. Requests that the one hour maximum stay is reconsidered.</p> <p>The business permit cost is too high. Money is very tight and this is another cost that they cannot afford. They do not understand why businesses in Clifton are being charged more. Requests that a discount for very small businesses is included.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.1.4</p>
228	<p>Supplies a number of retailers in and around Clifton Village and is a regular visitor at weekends and evenings.</p> <p>One hour maximum stay is not long enough for a destination shopping area.</p> <p>The hours of 9.00am to 9.00pm seem too long.</p> <p>More mixed use bays are needed as too much space has been prioritised for residents.</p> <p>Clifton Village is a large retail area on top of a hill with poor public transport links and no car park. The car is so popular because people need it and because public transport does not provide a good enough service.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.5.1</p>

229	Requests that the double yellow lines in The Paragon are retained. They are invaluable and make perfect sense as currently arranged. Without the lines in place there would be obstruction on a daily basis.	5.6
230	<p>The scheme will not be of any benefit. He will have to pay to park where it was previously free and the areas in which he can park are restricted. There is no evidence that it will benefit him. There has not been research into traffic flows going in and out of the village.</p> <p>He can currently park on Clifton Down Road between 5pm and 9am Monday to Saturday and all day Sunday for free. Under the new proposal he will not be able to park for free until 9pm so will have to pay to park from 5.20pm when he returns from work.</p> <p>Concerned about the process followed to introduce the scheme. Believes the proposals are fundamentally flawed and are not fit for the stated purpose. Fundamental changes are needed before they are made viable and deliverable.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>
231	<p>Permits are too expensive. They will stop trade and retired people will struggle to pay.</p> <p>She can no longer drive, due to long term illness, so her daughter takes her shopping and comes in to check on her. Many friends also visit. The whole scheme is worrying. She might have to sell her house.</p> <p>Asks what painter and decorators will do.</p>	<p>3.1</p> <p>3.7</p>
232	<p>Objects to the expansion of residents' parking, particularly in Clifton, on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Free parking for a limited period would have retained his custom. If he has to pay and is limited to one hour he will go elsewhere.</li> <li>2. The scheme will push commuter parking onto the Downs, which will spoil its amenity. This also applies to Leigh Woods.</li> <li>3. The dismissal of free parking for longer than 30 minutes is not convincing. He will have to pay with the money going towards the administration of the collection of that money and not to anything worthwhile. This is a waste of money.</li> <li>4. Concerned that the scheme will soon be extended to evenings and Sundays. Makes several trips to Christ Church each Sunday for voluntary duties.</li> <li>5. The daytime activities at Christ Church will suffer as volunteers will not want to pay to park.</li> </ol> <p>It is designed to punish motorists. The proposals are divisive and irreversible and no thought has been given to their consequences.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1</p>
233	<p>100% against the proposal as business owners and residents are not being listened to.</p> <p>Works in                      in Clifton Village. Most customers drive and a maximum stay of one hour makes it much less likely that they will come. Clifton shoppers like to spend time enjoying the range of shops on offer and often come from relatively far afield, so driving is the best option for them. If the business were to lose just 5-10% of its custom then it would have to consider closing.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>4.2</p>

234		Younger people sharing flats cannot afford £192 for a permit. Needs his car to travel to his parents near Reading where there are no transport links at the other end of the journey. His only other option is to move but this is social engineering.	3.1.2
235		Does not want to pay for parking where he lives. Does not want to pay for friends and relatives to park, or to register their cars. Does not want to pay for extra traffic wardens and administration. Does not want extra yellow lines or time limited parking bays.  The wishes of residents should be listened to.	1
236		The proposed parking on the corner of Victoria Square and Merchants Road is very dangerous. It is a blind corner on a bus route and the parking will make it impossible for vehicles to pass each other. As it is, buses have to stop and wait for clear access to get round the corner.	5.14
237		Very much in favour of the scheme, having had previous experience of schemes in London and Brighton and Hove and having suffered from commuter parking in Clifton.	Comments noted
238		The parking issue has been caused by granting permission for too many houses to be turned into small flats. The parking scheme is unattractive and unwelcome.	1
239		They both need cars for work as he is an architectural photographer working around the country and his wife works at Southmead and Frenchay Hospitals and is on call at nights and weekends.  It is essential that his wife can park close to where they live on call nights. She usually parks in Boyces Avenue after 6pm.	3.3
240		The reasons given for the scheme do not consider the negative impact it will have.  The restrictions being extended to 9pm offers no benefit to residents and seems to be an attempt to make money. It will discourage visitors and damage businesses.  There is no democratic mandate for its introduction.  The only current parking problems are due to inconsiderate parking by tradespeople. The scheme should charge them more and residents far less. The fact that this is not so indicates that the scheme is intended to make money. This is evident in the cost of the medical permit.	1  3.4  2  3.2.1

241	<p>Strongly supports the proposals. The establishment of a scheme is long overdue. Hopes that it will not be derailed by alarmist and misguided opposition.</p> <p>Would like to see some detailed changes but the important thing is to introduce the scheme.</p>	Comments noted
242	<p>Strongly objects on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If the scheme is intended to address commuter parking, why are the restrictions proposed from Monday to Saturday until 9pm each evening?</li> <li>2. Limiting pay parking to one hour will make it impossible to host social gatherings in the evenings unless people travel by public transport or taxi.</li> <li>3. Main concern is the impact on shops and businesses of limiting visitors to one hour.</li> <li>4. The Council should know how many restricted spaces will be available compared with how many people visit Clifton by car before introducing the scheme.</li> </ol> <p>Requests that we:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase the minimum stay from one hour</li> <li>2. Operate the scheme on Monday to Friday only and until 6.00pm.</li> <li>3. Carry out research to ensure that there is sufficient space to park.</li> </ol>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.3</p>
243	<p>Clifton has some of the densest multi-occupancy housing in the UK. Residents should be permitted to park in as much of the zone as possible. Many residents are self-employed and do not leave their homes during working hours as that is when they receive visitors.</p>	3.3
244	<p>One hour parking times should be increased to two hours to give people time to eat/shop in Clifton Village.</p> <p>Permit parking should be provided between the garages on the north side. There will not be enough space otherwise. Asks whether the permits will be road based or Clifton Village based.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>5.5</p>
245	<p>Very concerned about the proposal to remove double yellow lines from the Paragon. Creating a free-for-all will result in the street being regularly blocked by vans and opportunist parkers.</p> <p>The road will be impassable if cars are parked on both sides. This will result in cars and vans parking on the pavement.</p> <p>Parking on the side of the street with the houses will lead to pavement parking to make room for cars trying to squeeze past the vehicles parked on both sides. It is an unworkable proposal.</p> <p>The original coal holes are under the pavement along the entire street so the pavement will not support the weight of cars and vans.</p> <p>If the double yellow lines are removed from the cul-de-sac end of the street and vehicles allowed to</p>	<p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p>

		park there it will be impossible to turn, meaning that reversing will be the only way of getting out of the street. This will be almost impossible with cars parked on both sides of the street.	
246		The proposal is another tax on motorists. The plans have not been thought through, are inconsistent and will only disadvantage residents. Visitors will be disadvantaged and businesses will suffer.	3.1.1
247		<p>The plans are not workable in their current state, they are unviable, significant change is required before they will work. It makes residents and businesses pay for less of what they already have for free. Many businesses will not survive.</p> <p>It will make life difficult for residents as it will not guarantee parking and will provide fewer parking spaces than there are now. The Council should be providing more parking, not taking spaces away.</p> <p>It is being undemocratically imposed on people.</p> <p>Teachers are leaving many schools already affected by parking zones and many in Clifton schools will follow.</p> <p>Consultation was inadequate. Initial consultation did not occur and informal consultation was cut short by one week. There must be a legal challenge to the validity of the scheme.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>2</p> <p>4</p> <p>2</p>
248		<p>Does not want to pay for it being more difficult to park. The residents are the problem, not the commuters, so the scheme will not help.</p> <p>Local businesses will suffer.</p> <p>Pay &amp; display machines are ugly and unnecessary.</p> <p>The scheme will only raise revenue and will not bring benefits.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1</p>
249		<p>Why fix what isn't broken?</p> <p>The idea should be stopped before it goes any further.</p>	1
250		<p>The scheme is being undemocratically imposed.</p> <p>It is bad for residents, businesses, those who work there and visitors. Works for the university and occasionally needs to bring her car to work. There are always parking spaces because residents leave to work elsewhere.</p> <p>Leigh Woods and the Downs will be full of displaced cars.</p> <p>Shops in Whiteladies Road and Clifton Village will suffer.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>4.1</p>

251	<p>The scheme will strangle the vibrant nature of the Village and will not benefit the residents that pay for it. It is another tax on those residents.</p> <p>It will affect businesses throughout the day and evening. Where will visitors to Redgrave Theatre park? Will the Downs become a car park for visitors?</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>1.3</p>
252	<p>Businesses will not survive and residents will not be able to receive visitors. This will be a sad existence. Has three friends that visit each Wednesday and they are now looking for alternative places to meet up.</p> <p>The solution is to limit parking to four hours other than for residents. That would allow businesses to thrive and residents to enjoy unrestricted social lives.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.2</p>
253	<p>Clifton should be left permit free. There has to be a better way than asking people to pay to park outside their house.</p>	<p>1</p>
254	<p>Understands that the scheme is intended to stop commuters and visitors driving into Clifton. Objects to this being financed by residents buying permits.</p> <p>There might not be enough space for permit holders. Often has to park in Cliftonwood due to lack of space but will not be able to now that they are in another zone.</p>	<p>3.1.3</p> <p>3.3</p>
255	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is prescriptive, complicated and expensive</li> <li>• The area is too large</li> <li>• There are not enough spaces for visitors</li> <li>• There will be ugly street furniture installed</li> <li>• The stress of finding parking will deter visitors and ruin businesses</li> </ul> <p>Does not believe that any scheme is necessary.</p>	<p>1</p>
256	<p>Has seen a leaflet being circulated attacking the proposals by making unsubstantiated accusations and attempting to prevent rational debate.</p> <p>Urges the Council not to be dissuaded by this and to be aware that some residents, including them, are wholly in favour of the scheme.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
257	<p>They have 15 spaces in their car park and space for 41 guests. The proposals make no allowance for long stay parking in the area. A feasible solution needs to be found for this and other hotels in the area as they all face the same issues. Hotel guests benefit the local economy and should be encouraged, not discouraged by parking restrictions. Hotel and guest permits should be made in the form of individual scratch cards instead of permits which have to be collected and could be lost.</p> <p>Business permits are limited in number and too expensive. A larger number of permits at a lower cost would be better. The current proposals could ruin their business.</p>	<p>4.3.2</p> <p>4.3.1</p>
258	<p>Travels to job on Clifton Down Road by car. Other options are not suitable – the bus would mean</p>	<p>4.5</p>

	<p>take 2 hours each way and she needs to look after her son when he gets home from school.</p> <p>Is a carer for her Nan and this will be difficult if inadequate public transport means that she is away from home for so much of the day.</p> <p>Public transport is too expensive on top of running the car which she needs to keep to visit her nan. Cycling is not a practical option due to the distance involved.</p>	
259	<p>The scheme will cause hardship for residents and businesses. She uses her car to visit various parts of Bristol to visit independent shops. Parking restrictions will prevent this so she will not be able to visit as public transport is inadequate. Parking restrictions will cause many people to visit out of town shopping centres instead.</p> <p>This scheme and others are being forced upon people against their will. People are very busy and need to juggle the demands of work and caring for relatives who may not live close by. They need to use their cars to access shops and services and visit friends and relatives.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>1</p>
260	<p>Objects to the scheme because knows people who live in the area and none of them want to be in it. Worried for the businesses there. Will be surprised if the scheme goes ahead after the protest.</p> <p>Lives just outside the scheme and would really like a scheme because it is impossible to park now the Cotham scheme is in and other scheme are starting soon. People's friends and family park on West Park to avoid paying for a permit for the Cotham scheme. Would like to be able to purchase a permit to park there but isn't allowed even though they live one street away.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>5.1</p>
262	<p>The parking scheme will leave the elderly and infirm disadvantaged.</p>	<p>3.7</p>
263	<p>Totally supports the scheme. Lives close to the Zoo and Clifton College and is fed up with parents, teachers, visitors and staff using the streets as a private car park. It is right that businesses pay for their parking needs and that visitors to the Zoo pay to park.</p> <p>Most Clifton residents work within Bristol or do not work, so very few need a car. Everyone should adapt to the reality of climate change.</p> <p>Asks what will happen when her parents make their annual visit from 300 miles away and what will happen when she hires a car for one day a month.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>3.6</p>
264	<p>Totally supports the scheme.</p> <p>Has lived in Clifton for over 25 years and is a resident and business owner. Commuter parking is a serious problem, with people working at Clifton College clogging up the streets each day. People also park in her road and cycle into the city centre. Cannot wait for the scheme to begin.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>



		However, requests that the one hour restriction be extended to two hours to enable people to have lunch, shop etc.	4.2
265		Objects to the scheme being extended until 9.00pm in the evenings and to Saturdays as this is not necessary.	3.4
266		They qualify for permits but do not automatically have the option of applying for three permits despite there being 4 adults and 4 children in the household. Smaller households will effectively have one permit per adult.	3.1
		Permits are too expensive. There are no parking problems in Cecil Road now, it is another tax.	3.1
		There should be more free time so that people can visit the Zoo and staff in the residents' houses can keep their jobs. Weekends and bank Holidays should be unrestricted.	4.2
		It will inconvenience hundreds of people who use the streets to park whilst at work, e.g. teachers at local schools and business owners.	4.4
		No-one will benefit from the scheme.	1
267		Strongly objects to the changes proposed in Worcester Terrace. Believes that he should not be forced to pay to park outside his house when he has been parking there for free for the last 8 years.	1
268		Employs nearly 60 staff. Has 10 private parking spaces for staff and visitors. At least half their staff are usually working from the office at any one time. There is plenty of available free parking close to the offices now. It is always possible to park within a 5 or 10 minute walk. It is less easy to park in the southern section of the scheme area but residents would have been aware of this when moving in. It is unreasonable to hinder businesses by dramatically increasing parking provision for residents.	1
		The number of permits they can buy is completely inadequate. Small local shops will be able to buy the same number.	4.3
		There are no long stay car parks and public transport links are notoriously poor. The scheme will cause significant problems for their staff and visitors. Some members of staff will look for work elsewhere. The costs of the business will increase as they will need to buy permits and replace lost staff.	4.6.4 4.5
		Splitting the area into two has made this worse as their permits will only be valid in the southern half when there is plenty of available space in the northern half.	4.3.1

	<p>Their lease expires in 3 years' time and they are almost certain to look for premises elsewhere. It is unlikely that anyone else will want to rent it which will cause difficulties for their landlord.</p>	1.3
269	<p>Visits the village at least five times a week. The parking has a natural ebb and flow which people are used to. Businesses are hanging by a thread and this scheme will destroy them.</p>	1.3
270	<p>Lives in Southville and works in Clifton. Manages to park every day so does not believe there is a problem.</p> <p>It is unreasonable to pay an extra tax to park outside her house.</p> <p>There is no direct bus service and as she uses her car for work she has no alternative. No alternatives are offered as part of these proposals.</p> <p>The scheme will put an end to the free flow of people between the city's various hubs. This will damage businesses, particularly as one hour is not long enough to do anything.</p> <p>It will make it expensive to have visitors from other parts of the country.</p> <p>Her company will be forced to relocate if the scheme comes in. Businesses will be forced into the city centre and this will draw money away from the district centres.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
271	<p>Questions the one hour maximum stay. It is not enough time for shoppers to choose anything or to stop for a cup of coffee. All of the businesses will lose out.</p> <p>This scheme is intended to make it difficult to drive. Many district shopping areas have already lost out to commercial centres but we should not let this continue. Commercial success depends on ease of access for customers and staff.</p> <p>The small gain of removing commuters needs to be weighed against the ruination of an area which has been named as the best part of the best city in the UK.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
272	<p>1. Is not opposed to a reasonable scheme but paying £72 a year is not reasonable.</p> <p>2. Always has to park several streets away – will the permit be street specific?</p> <p>3. There should be a penalty for having more than two cars per household to discourage students.</p> <p>4. Hours of 8.30 until 6.00 are reasonable in residential streets but not in Clifton Village which will die, especially if the scheme operates on weekends.</p> <p>5. Clifton should be charged the same as Southville.</p> <p>6. Disabled bay requirements should be reviewed regularly as a matter of course.</p> <p>Works in Southmead and cannot park anywhere close to work and now won't be able to park close to home either. There are not enough cycle lanes to make it safe for cyclists and public transport for healthcare workers is no good either.</p>	<p>3.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>5.1</p>

273	Objects to increased and unnecessary parking restrictions.	1
274	Enjoys visiting Clifton regularly. Does not experience many parking problems and would be put off by having only short term parking options available. Residents' parking is unnecessary.	1
275	Objects to the removal of double yellow lines at the end of The Paragon. Cars will park there and block cars already parked at the end of the cul de sac. If a car is parked where the yellow lines currently are it blocks the road.	5.6
276	Adequate public transport should be in place before the scheme is introduced. A lot of businesses rely on evening trade but no night buses are in place.	5.5
	The scheme should not run until 9pm. Other areas show that 9-5 works.	3.4
277	The scheme will damage the area with loss of business caused by people being unable to park without a permit.	4.1
278	Supports residents' parking from 8am-8pm as it takes a long time to get home and people park when they're going out in the evenings and do not consider residents.	3.4
279	Objects to the operation of the scheme until 9pm and on Saturdays.	3.4
	More free visitors' permits should be issued as people will have many more visitors in the evening and at weekends than during 9-5 Monday to Friday. The number of pay & display bays are limited and restricted.	3.6
	Objects to the permit price varying according to the car. The first permit should be free for any car. Does not understand why VED is taken into account at all.	3.2.2
	Car owners are being penalised whereas motorbikes, which are just as environmentally unfriendly and cause more noise pollution, are rewarded by being exempt.	3.2.3
280	Has no problem with the current situation. Does not want residents parking to be imposed. It is a way of raising money and will not benefit residents. She has stopped visiting friends in areas where residents' parking has been introduced.	1
	If it is not intended to raise money then all income generated should go to charity.	
281	Objects to the scheme because it is unworkable and significant changes need to be made to make it workable and deliver what is required. The consultation has been fast tracked, the businesses have	2

	<p>been completely overlooked and further consultation is needed.</p> <p>One hour parking will directly result in a loss of trade for businesses. People like to spend a few leisurely hours in the village.</p> <p>There is inadequate public transport links to Clifton Village. Only two bus services serve the village and this is not enough for employees, customers and residents.</p> <p>There needs to be a car park in the area.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6.4</p>
282	Identical to objection 280.	1
283	<p>One hour parking for visitors is inadequate. Visitors should be welcomed; they need more than an hour to browse in shops, meet friends for lunch etc. A 3-4 hour stay is more realistic. Accepts that there is a case for restricting city workers from parking in the area but 4 hour bays would still do this.</p> <p>The current proposal will mean that shops and businesses cannot survive. Local custom alone will not be enough to pay the bills.</p> <p>Visitors' permits will be used up quickly and people will be reluctant to visit once they have run out. The four hourly stay should total £1 or £2.</p> <p>Clifton Village works now, as spaces are used by visitors during the day and residents in the evening.</p> <p>As there is no public car park, people will go elsewhere.</p> <p>Permits for residents should cost the same as in other schemes.</p> <p>Free parking should be provided to enable people to access areas of natural beauty such as around the Suspension Bridge and the Downs. Some parking spaces should be free to cater for this. Increased parking restrictions around Bristol are off-putting to visitors. Only those with money can afford to park close to the Harbourside. Implementing free parking would boost visitor numbers.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.1.1</p>
284	<p>Owens a work space in Clifton Village and sometimes drives if the weather is bad or she has shopping to carry.</p> <p>Restricting visitors to one hour will have a detrimental impact on the atmosphere of the Village.</p> <p>Leigh Woods will be filled with commuter cars. It is already dangerous with cars parked on blind bends.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>5.2</p>

285	Has lived in Clifton Village for 20 years and is disappointed the plans are going ahead.	2.2.3
	His fellow residents in York Gardens share his concerns. The number of spaces provided falls far below that required and no thought has been given to the effect this will have. Parking has been a longstanding issue but these plans will make it worse.	3.3
	Clifton has been targeted with more restrictive plans than other areas. It is the heart of Bristol, receiving large numbers of visitors and tourists which generates an income for local businesses. These businesses will not survive.	4
286	There should be three hour visitor parking everywhere, not just one and two hours.	4.2
	Residents' parking should stop at 7pm not 9pm. Saturdays and Sundays should be free for everyone as this will help traders.	3.4
287	Lives in a shared house with three other people. Two people live in the basement which has been converted into a flat. They cannot share cars like a family might be able to. They have four cars and a van between them so will have to move out if they cannot buy more than three permits.	3.1.2
	They can always find somewhere to park now. Commuters park in their spaces when they leave and they use them again on their return.	1.2
	Public transport is not a viable option for them.	4.5
288	Is a resident and a doctor working in a GP practice in Clifton. Is happy with the existing system and does not want to pay to park or to have the neighbourhood blighted by pay & display machines and unnecessary lines and signs.	1
	Elderly patients attending the practice require appointments of indeterminate duration and they would suffer stress and difficulty if they had to be constantly mindful of moving their car.	4.2
289	Supports residents' parking as this will give her some chance of parking near to where she lives. Does not mind paying for an annual permit and thinks that the second permit should be charged at a much higher rate.	
	Concerned about parking for visitors. If it is too difficult or expensive then people won't come. It would be better to have a system where payment is only required for an hour in the middle of the day as this will deter commuters but still allow people to visit the Village for a few hours. This could also be easier to enforce.	4.1
290	Does not want pay & display machines installed. Limited waiting for non-permit holders would be a much better system. The machines are ugly and expensive to maintain.	4.1.5
	Residents pay high council tax and should not have to pay for their permit. If anyone pays it should be the commuters.	3.1.3

		They should not pay more than the existing Kingsdown and Cotham schemes.	3.1.4
		It should have the same operating hours as Kingsdown and Cotham – 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday.	3.4
291		Asks whether additional public transport will be provided between Ashley Down/Glos Road and Clifton. Lives in Ashley Down, where the only bus service goes into the city centre getting caught in traffic.	4.5
		Usually cycles in the summer but does not cycle in the dark so a bus service would be the most convenient alternative.	4.6
292		Regularly travels to Clifton for business and leisure. The current system enables him to park without constantly checking that he is within the allotted time period for returning to the car. Clifton is unique and the introduction of a permit system will change the area and discourage visitors. This could have a significant impact on business.	4.2
		It is only intended to generate revenue for the Council.	3.1
293		Is a resident and runs a business in Clifton.	Comments noted
		Is in favour of the scheme. Believes that most people who support it are quietly keeping their views to themselves, in contrast to the vocal opposition.	
		The scheme is very necessary; the Council have consulted widely on it and have revised it thoughtfully following the initial consultation.	
294		Objects on the following grounds: 1. Impact on parking in residential areas surrounding the Village, particularly the Sneyd Park area. 2. Lack of direct public transport connections from the west of the city. 3. Impact on the welfare and livelihood of employees working for businesses within the Village. 4. Direct and indirect impact on services and businesses within the Village. 5. Additional financial burden placed on commuters.	5.2 4.5 4.4 4.1.3 4.4
		Mazars will not be able to buy sufficient parking permits for their needs which, coupled with inadequate pay & display parking and inadequate public transport links, will cause people to leave. The firm will be unable to properly serve its clients and the local businesses that are currently supported by employees buying lunch etc will lose out.	4.3
		There should be a public transport service from Portway P&R into Clifton as this would be useful to more people than the new link from Long Ashton.	4.5.3
		There is no information about pay & display charges. This should be made clear.	4.2.5
		The scheme is intended to drive out businesses and commuters, not to better serve residents. People live in the Village because they want to enjoy the hustle and bustle of its busy social life. The	1

		scheme will end that.	
295		<p>Object to one hour parking. It will cause the shops to close. It is not long enough to get your hair done, look for clothes, choose a gift, have a coffee or meal.</p> <p>Residents enter Vyvyan Terrace at the bottom end i.e. (Vyvyan House from Clifton Park), as the road lends itself to echelon parking with a right hand vehicle on the terrace side of the road. But there are so many people driving around trying to park that when you pull out and drive up the terrace they meet you head on blocking your exit. This causes aggravation. Vyvyan Terrace should become a one way street.</p> <p>The restrictions should be changed to a 5 day week, Monday to Friday, as problems are caused by commuters coming into the city and parking all day. We have three sons and their families who come into town to see us every weekend either a Saturday or Sunday. They have always been able to park in the Terrace. This will give all residents a chance to keep their weekends the same and not devalue our quality of life. The 9pm finishing time is too late.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>3.4</p>
296		<p>Requests the removal of proposed double yellow lines from his dropped kerb.</p> <p>States that it is unnecessary to have the double yellows across his driveway as he has a lawful right of access and egress onto his drive and the lines are therefore an unwarranted restriction.</p> <p>States that Clifton Park Road is extremely narrow and to have parking on both sides of the road would make the carriageway un-passable. Currently cars do park here and it creates problems for vehicles already but these vehicles park half on the kerb and half off the kerb, so if a dedicated bay was put in place then it would be impossible for any vehicle let alone an emergency vehicle to pass through.</p>	5.11
297		<p>Objects to the pay &amp; display in Northcote Road. If visitors to the Zoo use it there will be nowhere for residents to park.</p> <p>Enquires how many permits will be available to Clifton College. If the college is treated as 3 schools and given 21 permits and the Zoo are also given 7 permits, this will have an impact on the space available for residents.</p> <p>Does not understand why the pay &amp; display maximum stay is 1 hour in the Village and 5 hours on Northcote Road.</p>	<p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.2</p>
298		<p>The scheme will have a negative impact on their business and their patients and staff and also on businesses throughout the Village.</p> <p>40 consultants work from the premises under their own businesses. Many have additional staff of their own, eg secretaries, nurses and support staff. Consultants carry large medical record files and equipment and need to park nearby. If they cannot there will be health &amp; safety implications. They have opened a day surgery suite with three recovery rooms. There are several additional staff</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.6</p>

		<p>members and 7-10 additional patients each day. Their staff do not live locally. The scheme will mean some staff members and patients will be prevented from accessing the centre.</p> <p>There are no direct bus services or park &amp; ride links available for their staff. There is no suitable car park within walking distance and a maximum stay of 2-3 hours is insufficient.</p> <p>Some of their patients are terminally ill, frail and unable to walk very far so they need to park nearby.</p> <p>New double yellow lines will be introduced as well as permit parking. The proposals are unfair, unjust and unnecessary.</p> <p>As a business they bring many people into the Village and support local businesses there.</p> <p>There will be inadequate permits for their staff needs even if all of their registered professionals apply for a medical permit.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.3</p>
299		<p>The streets around Clifton are busy but it is rare that you would be unable to park reasonably close to your property. If the scheme comes in it will be harder to find a space. People will still require the use of their car but the scheme will make their lives more difficult.</p> <p>Most commuters have left the area by 6pm so there is no need for the scheme to be in place until 9pm.</p> <p>The scheme is intended to make money. If the scheme makes more money than it costs to run it then it should be clear exactly what the money is used for.</p> <p>Public transport should be improved before a scheme is introduced.</p> <p>If vehicles are causing obstruction the Council should enforce this without the use of a permit system.</p> <p>Signs, road markings and additional street furniture will be required. This is unsightly in a conservation area.</p> <p>The permit price should not be based on vehicle emissions. The annual charge will inevitably increase. The cost of the RPZ could make running a vehicle too expensive.</p> <p>If third permits are not issued to households they will still need their cars but will have to pay to park elsewhere. This will reduce the spaces available for permit holders. Many garages and driveways are not big enough to be used so those properties should be eligible for more than one permit.</p> <p>Car club bays will also reduce the space available to permit holders.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.3.1</p>



		Traders will suffer as people will not pay to park and there will be no more leisurely shopping as people will be up against the clock. The Council should be trying to attract visitors not penalising them. Many people would not visit the Zoo if they had to use pay & display.	4.1
		Residents and traders have not been made aware of the consultations. Perhaps the Council is trying to prevent objections being made.	2
301		Stays in accommodation in Clifton when working in Bristol. Residents' parking will affect where he chooses to stay.	4.3.4
301		Objects to the current proposals as the Permit Parking Area is inappropriate for their single narrow street.  If the double yellow lines are removed it will be a disaster as the cars parked on the outside of the curve will entirely block the road.  States that it would be best to revert to the permit holders bays as shown in the informal consultation.	5.6
302		Currently parks in Clifton and walks into their office in the centre. It is necessary to drop their daughter off to nursery before she starts work. Needs to have her car close by in case she needs to pick up her Daughter. It is not possible or practical for everyone to get the bus or cycle to work.  Parking is restricted in Redland and will soon not be able to park anywhere in Bristol without it costing a fortune.  Clifton is a favourite location for mothers to meet and attend groups. She will no longer be able to attend as she does not live in Clifton and will not be able to park.	4.6  5.1  4.1
303		They have never had a problem parking on the street outside their property which is split into flats. Does not believe the scheme is necessary as both residents and non-residents working the City centre use the roads in harmony. Happy for a commuter to take her space in the morning as she can she park there when the commuter has left.  Admits that visitors to the Zoo can make it difficult to park but it could be alleviated by the Zoo offering discounted parking against ticket prices.  Believes that the scheme is being introduced purely to make profit whilst they already pay a hefty council tax bill.  The scheme will bring many more pay and display spaces than spaces for residents. This will mean that they will have to pay for parking but it will be less likely that they can find a space.	1.2      3.1.3  3.3

		It will make life more difficult for visitors – particularly those that are elderly but do not have a disabled parking permit and tradespeople.	3.9
		It will kill the independent shops, cafes and restaurants. She would stop using the Village for groceries if she had to pay for parking.	4.1
		The scheme has been developed to suit a minority without clear communication to the public. Notices on lampposts do not constitute a transparent proposal or public information campaign.	2
		Having to pay for parking is likely to force many young professionals from the area.	1
304		The majority of people do not want parking restrictions it will do irreparable damage to the thriving retail, business and educational community.	1
		One hour parking is insufficient to park and visit the local shops or conduct meetings.	4.2
		Leigh Woods will be gridlocked as people will park along both sides of the road.	5.2
305		Clifton Village has a diverse area of small businesses and independent retailers with medium sized businesses. The one hour parking restriction will curtail most activities. Two to three hour parking is more sensible for visitors.	4.2
		The double yellow lines of Royal York Crescent are scandalous and ill thought out as it would mean losing 35-40 spaces for residents.	5.5
		There is no calculation of how many spaces that residents would be gaining in residents' parking. This could only come from a direct assessment and research, which has still not been considered. It is a tax regardless of consequences.	3.3
		No assessment of the effect of added street signage and parking metres on in listed heritage pavements or streets. This will look ghastly and has added trip/manoeuvring hazard on narrow pavements.	4.1.5
		20 mph have been introduced unannounced and in areas such as the Promenade where it is clearly unneeded and slows vehicles, adds to pollution levels and costs businesses.	5.1
		Sensible consultation and democratic process is needed rather than dictating and assuming the Councils plans are correct.	2
306		This parking scheme will only push the parking problem elsewhere as the scheme hasn't properly considered other solutions or consequences of planning constraints. Planning restraints should be lifted and reversed-commercial property should be encouraged to build on –site parking or provide their own off street parking solutions.	5.2

		<p>The assertion that public transport will solve this problem is wishful thinking and should not form any part of decision making.</p> <p>A new car park needs to be built somewhere under the green next to Clifton Village. Since the scheme is self-financing a car park operator could be found who would pay for this.</p> <p>Leigh Woods will become a free car park, therefore a park and ride in Ashton Court at the Leigh Woods needs to be considered.</p> <p>Pay and display is ugly and permit management is costly.</p> <p>There should be a park and ride service from near Ashton Court estate. There needs to be more joined up thinking among different departments. For the city to be successful then there needs to be smooth flowing public transport systems in place.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>4.5</p>
307		<p>Objects to the current proposal to remove all the double yellow lines in The Paragon.</p> <p>Requests that we retain the current parking areas and keep the current yellow lines.</p>	5.6
308		<p>Feels that a max stay one hour does not give enough time for people to stay in the area and shop. Two hours is ideal as people can shop and not panic about being late back to the car.</p> <p>Controlled hours running from 9am to 9pm seem overly restrictive, 9-6 seems more appropriate and is in keeping with other schemes they have come across.</p> <p>Reduced parking spaces may force people to go round and round to find a space. This may deter people from shopping in Clifton Village, taking money away from amazing independent shops.</p> <p>At a time when everyone is struggling to make a living, it would be a shame to restrict access to Clifton and make small traders' lives just that bit more difficult.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.1</p>
309		<p>Residents are obliged to follow draconian and costly planning consents to maintain the area's unique heritage, yet the Council plans to install parking meters and cover the street with yellow lines and warning signs.</p> <p>Why hasn't some space in the new commercial development on Regent Street allocated to much needed additional parking space instead.</p>	<p>4.1.5</p> <p>4.6.4</p>
310		<p>Strongly suggests that the Mall becomes a one way street preferably from Gloucester Road/Beaufort Buildings entrance down to the Mall. Currently one side of this road does not allow parking, this means that delivery lorries and other cars can pass each other easily.</p> <p>Due to the high number of residents that live in the centre of the Village, all of The Mall parking</p>	<p>5.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p>

		should be shared use.	
311		The proposed one hour max stay limit is preposterous as their clients will need three to four hours to receive their treatments and service. Clients that do not live locally will cease visiting the business.	4.2
		Believes the scheme favours the evening restaurant trade as there is a three hour limit after 6pm.	4.2
		Due to paying higher than average business rates, there must be some concession to offset the additional charges for their clients and massive loss of revenue.	4.1
312		Owns a flat and garage on Royal York Crescent. The garage is not suitable for a car to park in and therefore the space outside is used as parking. There are over 200 houses on Royal York Crescent and it is imperative that as many parking spaces are freed up as possible.	5.5
		Wants to know why double yellow lines are proposed all the way along the garages on Royal York Crescent.	
313		Parking has never been an issue in Clifton Village	1.2
		Parking fees would hinder shoppers/visitors to the village	4.1
		Negative effect on suppliers/trade as parking pushes up prices.	4.1
314		In London the scheme worked by having restrictions in force for one hour per day. There was no need for the introduction of meters and wardens were only required to check on dangerous parking and permits for one hour.	3.4.4
		There needs to be lots of electric car stations, smaller parking spaces to encourage smaller cars, a proper park and ride within a few minutes of the Village, proper visitor parking such as a multi storey or underground car park and facility for students to drop their things off at the start of term.	4
		The scheme will be a challenge for local businesses which are already struggling to stay afloat if they have to accommodate more costs getting staff to work. Business permit costs are too high; we should be giving permits to support them.	4
		A one hour parking restriction is too short for any meaningful visit to Clifton Village.	4.2
		Monday to Saturday 9am-9pm operational hours are too restrictive	3.4
		Objects to the idea that people with off street parking are restricted to one permit when those in flats are eligible for three permits. It does not make sense to have two registration numbers on each permit as you may have one car out in the street when your spouse returns.	3.5
		Overall it looks much more like a revenue generation exercise for the Council rather something to help local residents.	3.1.1

		Older people also need to get into the Village and driving makes the most sense when you're not as mobile.	4.1
315		On the weekend Clifton is visited by so many people and they need to be able to park for more than one or two hours. They used to shop on Cotham Hill but now it is paid parking, they usually drive through.	4.2
		Their dentist is in Clyde Road and it is getting more difficult to park there as people have moved from other areas with parking restrictions.	4.1
316		Objects to the current proposals as it shows double yellow lines down one side of Royal York Crescent despite their request not to have this when they were consulted in November.	5.5
		The majority of garages on Royal York Crescent are not fit for purpose as they cannot fit modern cars. Removing the double yellow lines would release 30+ car parking spaces.	5.5
		Royal York Crescent is a beautiful example of Georgian Architecture and requires maintenance. Tradesmen will no longer be able to park in front of the houses of Royal York Crescent which would make the job very difficult.	5.5
		Feels that the views of both the traders and residents are being totally ignored in the consultations.	2.1 2.2
		Would like to know what research behind the statements that residents welcome the scheme.	1.2.2
317		None of the arguments put forward in support of the scheme are based on any real evidence.	1
		This is a costly capital expenditure and maintenance scheme which affects the residents of the area and they should be allowed to vote on this. If this were a private commercial proposal it would never be implemented as its cost would most certainly outweigh any benefits.	1
		Has lived in other areas of the city and whilst it is not easy to park in the area it is always possible and usually fairly simple when the students are away. Why all of the unnecessary expenditure in these difficult times.	1
		The proposed 9pm finishing time for Clifton Village is potentially damaging for local businesses.	3.4
		Siting pay machines on the already congested pavements is a hazard and eyesore.	4.1.5
318		Clifton Village is a suburb of the city centre and is not well served by public transport by the surrounding areas.	4.5
		Fair consideration should be given within the proposals to the needs of employers for staff parking permits.	4.4

	<p>The Council seeking to profiteer on the back of 'affluent' Clifton.</p> <p>If retailing in the Village is to prosper then there should be a 15/30min free parking allowance and paid parking should be available for a minimum of two hours.</p> <p>Concerned that the restrictions last until 9pm when most if not all suburban parking schemes operate only until 6pm.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p>
319	<p>Expresses support for the introduction of the RPS in Clifton Village. States that due to the Cliftonwood and Hotwells scheme, life would be intolerable in Clifton without an RPS.</p> <p>Claims that the campaign against the proposals and the arguments made, have taken scant regard of the changes made to the scheme by the Council following initial informal consultation.</p> <p>Would support a minimum stay of two hours maximum stay in the Village as one hour max stay would be difficult to enforce. Increasing the maximum stay to two hours would mitigate the concerns of shopkeepers.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>4.2</p>
320	<p>States that the proposals are a crude attempt at raising money by charging already overcharged businesses in Clifton for the privilege of fighting for even fewer parking spaces than they already have. The scheme will reduce spaces making it impossible to sustain businesses. The spaces designated to customers and clients are far too restrictive.</p> <p>Claims that the Council has not listened to any of the objections and has decided Bristol no longer needs a retail/business area in BS8.</p> <p>Does not think it is fair that other areas have cheaper permits.</p> <p>Asks why the scheme needs to run until 9pm.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.4</p>
321	<p>Objects completely stating that there is no way they would be able to cope and pay for parking and would have to contemplate moving from Clifton if the scheme were introduced.</p>	<p>1</p>
322	<p>The scheme will impact on several local business, putting shoppers off from quickly popping into Clifton, parking and entering an establishment. It will affect people picking up children at the local schools and colleges.</p> <p>The increase of traffic wardens in the area, targeting people purely for the monetary gain of the Council, will introduce a negative atmosphere as people will start arguing with the wardens.</p> <p>The scheme will put off friends visiting them at their home, especially during the day (they work from home) without the fear of getting a ticket.</p>	<p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.4.2</p>

		<p>It will put off Church goers on a Sunday.</p> <p>It will impact Old Vic theatre goers parking nearby. It will mean they could have to walk quite a distance in the dark to get to/from the venue.</p>	4.1
323		<p>The scheme will cause significant damage to local shops and restaurants. One hour parking is very limiting to shoppers who want to browse, meet with friends for a coffee/lunch and spend money in a lovely independent shopping area.</p> <p>The 9am to 9pm restrictions are ridiculous and unnecessary, this would exclude anyone who wants to shop in the area and bring much needed business to retailers.</p> <p>Regularly visits Clifton from Bath due to its array of independent shops and restaurants, the main draw to this is the ample free parking close to the shops.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p>
324		<p>Believe that this proposal would not benefit the local economy and would drive businesses away from Clifton Village, resulting in businesses disappearing from the streets of Clifton.</p> <p>The time sufficient for pay and display would be a minimum of two hours.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>
325		<p>Registers full support for the RPS plans.</p> <p>Think the anti-campaign has been far from balanced in their posters and abhors the idea of covering official Council posters with their own amateur versions.</p>	Comments noted
326		<p>Asks how the Council came to the conclusion that this was the best solution to the traffic problem in Bristol. Other solutions should be considered.</p> <p>Asks how the Council is going to measure its success. If the scheme was not to meet the health or financial expectations that were originally set out then how does the Council propose to make it up to the local residents and businesses affected?</p> <p>Why are the Redland and Kingsdown prices for cars less expensive than those proposed for Clifton and Clifton Village?</p> <p>Why are businesses in Clifton Village expected to pay £200 for one space when others in the city pay less than this?</p> <p>With no public car parking in Clifton Village, where are visitors meant to park?</p> <p>These proposals are hugely unpopular across the city and the Council should be listening to the people of Bristol.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>6</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>2</p>
327		<p>Expresses full support for the proposals for the proposed Clifton Village RPS. Believes that this is a necessity to improve the area.</p>	Comments noted

		Feels that the issue has been hijacked by a vocal minority, but to prove this is the case, maybe BCC would consider some kind of controlled electronic vote/referendum on the issue?	
328		<p>Objects to the all hours ban on all parking on the Crescent side of the road i.e. outside of the garages.</p> <p>Historically there is sufficient space for approximately 35 cars on this side of the road, withdrawing these spaces will reduce the total number of residents only parking bays on the street to approximately 76 to be shared between 50 houses most of which contain five apartments.</p> <p>Does not see why the imposition of the RPS has to be accompanied by such a radical reduction in the number of spaces, unless it is part of BCCs general anti car/anti-business.</p> <p>This unnecessary restriction will make living on the street untenable and highly stressful. Please revive the proposals to allow a more realistic apportionment of spaces commensurate with the number of apartments/inhabitants of Royal York Crescent.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p>
329		<p>Expresses general support of a RPS but does not support the one hour maximum stay limit which will kill much of the trade in Clifton Village, leaving only supermarket outlets and a few pubs to survive.</p> <p>The traffic that currently parks in Clifton will just go elsewhere, the Downs will become even more of a car park, Stoke Hill and Leigh Woods will be used by commuters. Ladies Mile is currently used by the workers of the huge Simply Health building which was given planning permission without car parking.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>5.2</p>
330		<p>Believes that moves to bring in a scheme such as this to this area are short sighted and will be detrimental to all concerned, including ultimately the City Treasury.</p> <p>Clifton Village is geographically 'on a limb' being on a hill and because of the restrictive access of the bridge. It is not particularly well served by public transport.</p> <p>Not only would the Village ambiance be destroyed but also retailers would inevitably suffer as their customers and workers would now be dissuaded from shopping there.</p> <p>Concerned that the inevitable spill over of people looking to park for free in Leigh Woods and the detrimental effect that this would have on its residents.</p> <p>Questions what the scheme is actually trying to achieve. More money or a serious attempt to address parking issues. Thinks that now is not the time to heap more tax on retailers or residents.</p> <p>There are simply not enough car parks and insufficient park and ride alternatives in place for this scheme to be effective on its own.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.5</p>
331		States that the streets do get busy with commuters but it is very rare that you're unable to find a space within a reasonable distance from your property.	3.3.1



	<p>The scheme penalises the residents of Clifton and the traders rather than trying to deter the commuters from parking in residential areas.</p>	<p>1.2 1.3</p>
	<p>The Council have allowed the conversion of a number of buildings into flats without the provision of parking. This inevitably increases the amount of cars due to the increase in the number of occupants in the building. Making parking costly and difficult won't stop people requiring vehicles for work/leisure/social reasons. It will make people's lives more difficult especially at a time of increases in day to day living costs.</p>	<p>3.3.1 3.5 1.2</p>
	<p>The scheme is set to operate from 9am to 9pm, yet most commuters have left the area by 6pm. These longer hours will penalise those residents who have been unable to park within their permit area and have to pay to park in a nearby zone via a meter.</p>	<p>3.4.1</p>
	<p>Before the Council try to implement a permit scheme, public transport infrastructure should be improved. Without this in place, people will inevitably need the use of a private vehicle for day to day living.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
	<p>There is no guaranteed parking space on their own roads at present, but residents are less likely to be able to park in their street once a permit system is introduced due to the reduction in spaces.</p>	<p>1.2.1</p>
	<p>Commuters usually come into an area before 9am and leave around 5 or 6. This is acceptable for most residents as they are leaving the area and returning between these times. Why would the permit make this easier?</p>	<p>3.3.1</p>
	<p>If each resident were to take up the offer of one permit at the lowest cost of £48 the potential income from is £192000 per annum. This does not take into account the additional revenue raised by parking fines, additional permits for traders and additional permits per households/visitor parking. It sounds as though this is a revenue making scheme for the Council especially as there are already a number of schemes in place. If there is a huge pot of money from the permit schemes that is above and beyond the requirements for the running of these schemes, is the Council going to refund the residents? There should be clear and easily accessible information on what the proceeds of the scheme are being used for.</p>	<p>3.1.1</p>
	<p>Signs, road markings and additional street furniture will be required to define each of the zones and costs to park. Lives in a conservation area and finds the implementation of street furniture uncharacteristic of the residential streets and will reduce the aesthetics of the area.</p>	<p>4.1.5</p>
	<p>Why does the Council have a permit scheme where the price is dependent on car emissions? A car is a car and will use a space no matter what size engine it has? The RPS is not an environmental issue.</p>	<p>3.2.2</p>

		<p>Limiting households to three permits will not stop people requiring cars, people will have to pay to park in nearby streets, which will in turn will reduce spaces. Additional car club bays will also reduce spaces.</p> <p>Households with garages should not be eligible for just one permit as garages are often not big enough to park a vehicle in and properties with driveways have already paid a premium for that privilege in the cost of their house.</p> <p>Traders in RPS areas, especially Clifton Village will suffer. People will not be able to park for long enough to have a coffee at one of the many cafes. People will not pay for parking on top to have their hair cut. There will be no more leisurely shopping in the village, it will be a race against the clock to ensure you return within the time allowed.</p> <p>Most people own a vehicle due to the necessity to get to and from work etc. They already pay the high costs of running a vehicle, taxing, insuring and maintaining it. The costs of the RPS could be the straw that breaks the camels' back in these times of high living costs.</p> <p>They moved into the city centre so that they would not have to use their vehicle as often. Believes they are being penalised for this as if they leave their vehicle at home and don't have a permit they risk being fined/towed.</p> <p>The Council attempts to attract people to the area with events like the balloon fiesta, the zoo, cabot circus but penalise these people who bring funding into the city by preventing them from parking. Knows many people who would not visit the zoo if they could not gain entrance to the zoo car park and were tied to limited time scales on street at a premium cost.</p> <p>By putting zones in the Council are forcing other areas of Bristol to go down the same route, as the problem is being pushed from one area to another.</p> <p>Appalled that many residents/traders have not been made aware of the consultations that have recently taken place. Suggests that the scheme will go in no matter what, as the Council is trying to prevent objections being made.</p>	<p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>4.1.1, 4.1.2 &amp; 4.1.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>
332		<p>There is no evidence to show that the parking situation will improve if a scheme is bought in. Parking is worse in the evening which shows that all of the cars are residents' cars.</p> <p>The parking situation will be made worse because the amount of spaces is going to be substantially reduced.</p> <p>The proposals show double yellow lines in front of the garages on Royal York Crescent. These spaces are used by the garage owners for their cars. This will be a loss of about 35 spaces. How</p>	<p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>5.5</p>

		<p>will this be offset?</p> <p>Stores their bike, along with two other people in a neighbour's garage on Royal York Crescent. They will now have to park their car in their garage instead of in front of it. Therefore three people will have lost their green option of travelling around the city.</p> <p>Often has to park in the Cliftonwood &amp; Hotwells scheme area but this will no longer be possible unless there is a dual permit for boundary streets. The scheme will restrict the area in which one can park.</p> <p>Asks what measures and performance indicators are there in place to see if the scheme has been a success. How is this possible without evidence of current parking practices?</p> <p>Loves living in Bristol, especially Clifton. Manages with parking issues now and cannot be without a car due to working out of the city four days a week. It seems ironic that a scheme which is supposedly trying to help residents' will force them away.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>1.2</p>
333		<p>The scheme will mean that instead of a 10 minute drive to work she will have an hour long journey – to get from Victoria Park to Clifton. It will have a huge impact on her work life balance i.e. spending more time commuting and less time at home.</p> <p>Due to the nature of her work, they rely heavily on cars to travel to and from locations. The company is always having cars delivered/collected/dropped off. It is already difficult trying to find parking in Clifton and not being able to park the hire car near the office for an early Monday collection is going to cause problems.</p> <p>Thinks the Council is deluded by the idea of utopian living by removing traffic from the city centre and encouraging everyone to cycle and walk. It is okay for people that live in the town centre, but a lot of people travel in from outside the city centre and it is going to cause further congestion by restricting routes and access.</p> <p>Bristol does not have the infrastructure for cycling in the city and Clifton is up a massive hill. With the lack of safe, decent cycle paths on commuter routes it makes riding a bike to work a terrifying experience especially if you're not a confident cyclist.</p> <p>People will always have cars and they will now have to pay to get permits for when they already pay car tax and council tax. The car industry contributes a huge amount to the economy of this country so to try and get rid of cars seems ludicrous.</p> <p>Appreciates that students bring a lot of money into Bristol, but they must be the main cause of parking problems within the city. Each flat/student house must have more than one car and its quite evident during holiday periods that parking issues are massively reduced.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>4.1.4</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.2</p>

		Has friends in Clifton that are angry that they are having to pay for parking permits when they are not guaranteed a space.	3.3
		Angry that the Council are taking her freedom of choice away from her. It is her decision on how she gets to and from work. By putting these parking restrictions in place it is making everyone's lives more complicated, difficult and expensive.	1
334		Enquires as to how they can ensure that double yellow lines are not painted across the rear entrance to their property on Lower Redland Road.	5.1
335		States that they live in an area of limited parking. By splitting Pembroke Road down the middle his parking choices are restricted further.	5.2
		If he did not live near the border of a zone he would have full access to all the parking in the vicinity. By overlapping zones a little it would solve this problem.	5.2
336		The Council have been provided with a wealth of information and data which demonstrated the risk to commerce and infrastructure. It would seem nothing will stop this undemocratic process despite the vast majority of Clifton residents and traders being against it.	4.1
		No results or vote has been published which take these comments into account, suspects that if a vote was cast it would be a resounding no to the new scheme.	2
337		As one of the City's largest employers, our operations take place in a number of potential RPS areas with our staff, students and visitors living, studying and working throughout Bristol, often traveling between RPS areas. The current consultation process, which is based on a series of individual consultation exercises for each are, is unable to take account of such circumstances.	2
		The University continues to focus on what alternative travel arrangements the University itself can provide for its staff, students and visitors. We are extremely concerned that a significant minority of our staff may lose access to parking space without any understanding of what mitigating steps are being proposed.	4.4
		There are groups of people who continue to have need of a car for a range of reasons and it is not going to help our position as a major employer within the City if this group of people find that they have their parking capability withdrawn with no consultation carried out and no ready alternatives available.	4.6
		MetroBus and MetroRail will improve alternative transport options for commuters but they will not be ready in time to support the RPS implementation programme. It is especially critical that viable alternatives are available at the time when restrictions are introduced.	4.5

		The University has a wide catchment area for staff; therefore there are those that are unable to use alternative methods of travel, resulting in more car drivers than we are able to accommodate within our own car parks.	4.4
		The removal of the free residential road parking will inevitably result in an increase in applications for staff to park in the University car parks at a time when the number of permits issued is already more than double the number of spaces available.	4.6
		Consideration should be given to reducing or amending the local hours of operation for shared use permit parking and pay and display spaces in the vicinity of the Richmond Building. The current proposals indicate permit parking from 9am to 9pm Monday to Saturday. This will limit the availability of local parking for the building for daytime visitors and significantly so for those attending evening events. Alternatively, it is requested that consideration is given to providing additional pay and display only parking in and around the site.	3.4
		Consideration should be given to reducing local hours of operation for permit parking and shared use permit and pay and display spaces in the vicinity of Manor Hall for non-student event purposes. Alternatively, it is requested that consideration is given to providing additional pay and display only parking in and around the site.	3.4
338		States that it would be wonderful to ride a bicycle to work. However, as a trades person who attends many properties around Clifton he needs a van in order to complete his days trading, which will soon become more expensive due to the Councils parking fees.	3.9
		The Council state that the RPS will make safer roads. Could not find any evidence that the roads have been unsafe.	1
339		Believes that the scheme is proposed to make money. It is a dubious proposition that the current parking situation is capable of improvement.	1
		Visitors are the lifeblood of Clifton and any effort to limit their length of stay or number of stays is bound to result in fewer visiting. There will also be disruption to commercial activity, house building and repairs, delivery and fitting. Even those with garages who are accustomed to vacating their garages for tradesmen and longer term visitors and taking their chance with the parking will not be able to accommodate these visitors. The boarding house trade will die.	4.1 3.9
		The one hour limit will be insufficient for those who shop and lunch in the Village.	4.2
		To extend the parking regulation to 9pm is an intolerable burden on restaurants and pubs; visitors from other parts of the city and outsiders simply will not come however specialist the eatery may be.	3.4
		The needs of the number of older residents will not be satisfied by these restrictions; visitors and	3.7

		<p>helpers generally will be seriously affected, and so will those businesses which depend on them.</p> <p>The bus services are inadequate.</p> <p>It is not only the commercial heart of Clifton which will be battered, it will be the quality of life which has always been its strength which brings in the comfortably retired new resident; these will be fewer once the effect of the parking scheme is fully felt.</p> <p>Given the expense of setting up the scheme with all its attendant complex bureaucracy it will not bring in the income to make up for the loss of business rates on shut commercial undertakings, let alone compensate for the change for the worse in Clifton generally.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.1</p>
340		<p>There has been inadequate consultation in respect of this proposal. The consultations and public meetings have confirmed that whilst the representations made have been considered, this has been carried out with a closed mind. The principle of parking restrictions being applied is not up for debate, so the consultations are fundamentally flawed from the outset.</p> <p>Inadequate information on the effect of these proposals has been provided to enable proper consideration of these constraints proposed both for residents and businesses within the localities in which the orders have been published.</p> <p>It is clear that a number of businesses will be unable to operate effectively within the localities affected by these orders. These businesses have or are preparing to vacate Bristol to enable them to survive and this is not in the best interests of Bristol.</p> <p>Inadequate alternative arrangements for transportation do not exist. There are no plans as yet published to indicate adequate off-street parking will be available and plans for transport of people are not yet sufficiently far advanced to enable parking constraints to be applied within the communities affected.</p> <p>Inadequate notice has been given for the property he owns in Clifton which is currently tenanted.</p> <p>Insufficient information or consideration has been given to the ratio of permits issued to the number of spaces that will be provided following the implementation of the order.</p> <p>The RPS should be delayed to enable the delivery of the promised transport schemes to enable the community both business and private to function properly.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>2</p> <p>4.3</p>
341		<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of public transport connections directly into Clifton Village.</li> <li>• The lack of public car parks in the vicinity.</li> <li>• Impact on parking in residential areas around Clifton Village and the likelihood that the area of</li> </ul>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>5.2</p>

		<p>RPS will therefore need expanding further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The additional burden, both from a financial and a time perspective, being placed on commuters.</li> <li>• The impact on businesses operating within Clifton Village.</li> </ul>	4.4
			4.1
		<p>Even with the full allocation of seven permits, it would only give the company a total of 15 car parking spaces. This is significantly less than the number of people that work for the company. Those that can walk/cycle to the office do, although there are no showering facilities in the building or space to add them, so the distances that people can travel to work this way are limited.</p>	4.3
		<p>Staff can be out of the building on client business and they need to return/leave, often with large bags. Not sure how this would work with the introduction of residents' parking. It would seem impractical as the only way would be for staff returning from a site visit would be for them to drop the bag off and use a short term bay to do so; drive their car away and come back to the office. From a commercial point of view, it would result in a significant amount of non-chargeable time being incurred by the firm. Taking the bag on public transport is something that is not practical from a Health and Safety point of view and a security point of view as they will be carrying confidential data.</p>	4.1.4
		<p>The allocation of seven permits is insufficient. This coupled with inadequate on-street pay and display and inadequate public transport links, particularly from the west of Bristol, shall force many of the firms' employees to seek other employment elsewhere or worse still for the community, the firms will relocate away from the area.</p>	4.3
		<p>If firms were to relocate then businesses within Clifton Village that are supported by the custom from the firms employees (such as local restaurants, pubs and convenience stores) will also suffer a steep downturn in their own trades.</p>	4.1.3
		<p>There are no viable alternatives for employees commuting large distances to their workplace from the west of Bristol. There has been no announcement of a service from the Portway park and ride directly to Clifton Village. Alternative public transport options would still involve them driving and leaving their car on another street or in a car park, so not really reducing the traffic problems around Bristol.</p>	4.5.3
		<p>There has been no mention of the charges that shall be enforced within the pay and display parking areas. This information should be publically announced immediately so the full financial impact on visitors and employees can be understood.</p>	4.2.5
		<p>The additional costs placed on commuters will be hard felt, particularly given the fragile state of the economy.</p>	4.4
		<p>Has never once felt unwelcome by people that live in the Village for parking on the streets, nor have</p>	

		they observed a significant number of people walking from Clifton Village to the centre of town. It appears that the long term strategy behind the proposal is to drive businesses out of Bristol.	1
342		Expresses strong support for the residential parking scheme in Clifton.  Understands that local businesses find the 1 hour parking limit for customers too short. Hopes that this can be resolved.	Comments noted 4.2
343		Concerned about the impact RPS will have on their business. Believes the revised plans are not fit for purpose.  The scheme has been fast tracked meaning vital early consultations were missed.  The lack of integrated transport links and the one hour parking in the village will be seriously detrimental to business.  Better transport links need to be in place before the RPS comes in.  High streets are already having a tough time in the light of out of town shopping centres and online shopping. High streets need to be made into social places with lots of people but aggressive parking policies do not encourage this.  A six month review is not a viable option for a small fragile business.	4  2  4.2  4.5  4.1  6
344		Moved to the area as was attracted by the cafes, shops and boutiques. There is not a problem with the current system, it works well for traders.  Disagrees that introducing a set of costly and complicated restrictions will make it easier for anyone to park. Trade will decline and shops will close down.  The houses in the area require a lot of maintenance and visits from tradespeople. 60 visitors' permits will be used very quickly.  The plethora of different parking restrictions throughout the village leaves scope for bureaucracy, confusion and fines.  Fundamentally objects because it is costly, bureaucratic and would limit the amount of parking spaces available to residents', workmen, family and friends and have an adverse effect on many of the independent businesses.	4.2  4.1  3.9  4.2  1
345		As a conservation area, it is the Council's duty to maintain and enhance the area. Personally does not think a ghost town with parking meters is either maintaining or enhancing a conservation area.  Planning legislation advises that it is the Councils duty to take into account the number and needs of the residents. Interested to know how many residents of Clifton own cars that the Council will be	4.1.5  3.3



		<p>safeguarding. We will all expect to be able to park outside our homes.</p> <p>RPS will bring passing buses to gawp at the bridge, the end of tourism and day trippers who boost the local and city economy, resulting in business closure. This leads to yet another ghost town and no rateable income for the Council.</p> <p>We have already lost valued businesses and the prospect of more global supermarkets/coffee shops is shocking. The Council should be encouraging and supporting local entrepreneurs.</p> <p>The scheme is not being rolled out in areas of the city which are more difficult to police. There should be no variation in any scheme, timing, pricing or geography</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>5.1</p>
346		<p>Is pleased to see that the Council has relaxed the restrictions in the North of the area and supports what the Council are proposing for north of Clifton Park.</p> <p>Objects strongly to reducing the allowed parking time to one hour in parts of the village for the majority of the day. This seems to be an unnecessary change and has not met anybody who has asked for this change to be done.</p>	<p>4.2</p>
347		<p>Many businesses will not be able to apply for sufficient permits to allow their employees to come to work and park for the day whilst they work. There is no viable alternative yet as public transport links to the area are very poor.</p> <p>These people will lose their jobs and employers will have to move their businesses. The employees coming into Clifton daily are the people spending money in the local community during the day. The loss of their daily business will clearly be very bad for the shops, cafes and restaurants.</p> <p>A one, two or three hour parking places will cause most shoppers and visitors that would normally come into Clifton to go to the Cribbs Mall or shop online. The RPS will be yet another unfair burden on their competitiveness and restriction on their businesses. It will be devastating for trade in the Clifton area.</p> <p>People will not be able to visit their elderly relatives within the operating hours of the scheme. Carers working in the area will not be able to park in the area. Elderly residents of Clifton will not be able to park outside their own tiny zones and therefore unable to go shopping for essentials. They will not be able to travel into a different zone to visit friends.</p> <p>Many children are forced to continue to live at their parents' home well into their twenties. This means that a four person family will be unable to have sufficient permits to cover their family if the two parents and two children all work in different locations. The same impact will be felt by residents of HMOs flats that BCC has encouraged through its planning policy.</p> <p>The scheme is another unfair tax on residents. The costs of the Clifton are well out of proportion to</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.7</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p>

		<p>any other scheme. They're far too high.</p> <p>Bristol Zoo will see a serious fall in daytime visitors with limited parking on premises and nowhere else for visitors to park. Nobody will pay £27 to visit the Zoo for one to three hours so they might as well close during the week as the majority of their visitors come from a 50 mile radius around Bristol and will not be able to park.</p> <p>The individual zones in the current scheme are far too small. Residents of one street will not be able to park on both sides of the street. Travel between zones will become impossible making life worse for everybody.</p> <p>The commuters currently parking in Clifton and walking down into the centre to work, should be encouraged to park in the city centre by the prices in the car parks being reduced significantly or by the improvement of park and ride facilities.</p> <p>Insufficient analysis and research on the impact of the RPS has been carried out.</p> <p>Insufficient consultation with residents and traders has been conducted.</p> <p>Bristol public transport system needs a massive overhaul and improvement.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>??</p> <p>4.4 4.6.4</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>4.5</p>
348		<p>Does not like the idea of paying for parking his car when, as a resident, is given no guarantee that he will be able to park anywhere in the zone at times of maximum density.</p> <p>Trying to cut down on car usage conflicts with the central Government's policy of stimulating growth. There are too many cars and there are going to be more and more. This new proposal for a restrictive car parking zone will not help the problem.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>1</p>
349		<p>Has lived in Clifton at various addresses and never has the provision of parking warranted a residents' scheme.</p> <p>Has chosen to purchase property in Clifton due to the stability of the market. Asks that the Council does not impose unwanted and unnecessary charges that are likely to damage the value of his asset.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>1.4</p>
350		<p>The free parking offered outside my house meant that despite living in an urban environment it is still entirely possible for friends and family to visit as and when they choose, not only to spend time at my home, but also to visit Clifton Village and other unique areas within the suburb.</p> <p>As a resident of Northcote Road living adjacent to Bristol Zoo, the week long ease of parking due to no permit being required makes up for the slightly heavier-than-usual traffic experienced on Saturdays.</p> <p>Strongly urges to keep Clifton the way it is - free from parking charges - as it is one of the small perks</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

		that makes the area so highly regarded.	
351		<p>There is no parking problem in Clifton for residents, has lived in York Place for the last two years and it has never been an issue.</p> <p>By introducing the RPS the Council are creating additional costs, and are restricting people visiting him for free. This is a human right.</p> <p>Shops will be adversely affected as people will not be able to park in Clifton or will object to paying for parking, there are more places that have free parking than Clifton.</p> <p>The Council states safety as a concern, yet this is completely unfounded.</p> <p>The Council clearly want no cars and no businesses in Clifton, the 20mph limit everywhere in Clifton and Redland is surely all that is needed.</p> <p>About to buy a house in Royal Park but does not see the point as he will not be able to park there. This would mean that Bristol City Council would not get the £8700 stamp duty.</p> <p>The Council have not stated anywhere how much residents will have to pay for a permit, so residents are getting charged for something of no benefit at all.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>2.2.2 3.5.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.1</p>
352		<p>Concerned about the lack of alternative public transport and parking facilities in the Clifton area.</p> <p>Commutes from South Wales and has to juggle child care and commute to get to work on time. Having investigated catching the train from South Wales the commute would take significantly longer making it totally impractical. This response is not from someone who uses a car by choice, it is a necessity as there is no alternative.</p> <p>Suggested that improvements could be made at very little cost to the Park and Ride scheme at Avonmouth – currently this does not operate a service up to Clifton so she would need to get a bus into the City centre and then up to Clifton. The only change the Council has made to public transport is to add an additional route from the Long Ashton Park and Ride which is great for people that live that side of town but ignores anyone that does not live on that side of the city. The response to the lack of public transport is totally inadequate.</p> <p>There is not one single public car park in Clifton and this also has been totally ignored in the proposals.</p> <p>The proposals will force many women to park on the Downs and walk into work often in the dark. This has also been totally ignored.</p> <p>The Council have totally disregarded the views of local businesses and those that commute here to</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.5.3</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>2.1.3</p>

		work, contributing to the local economy.	
353		One hour parking in Clifton Village is not long enough – two hours is needed for either a shopping trip or to eat in a restaurant.	4.2
		Stopping general parking between 10-12am and maybe 2-4pm will solve all the problems. It would certainly stop commuters.	3.4.5
354		Objects to the timing of the restriction on their street. Thinks that the restriction should be lifted earlier (5 or 6pm) at the latest in line with other areas of Bristol. By keeping it in place until 9pm, the Council will prohibit people from visiting residents as we will need to use hues passes up until 9pm just for one visit.	3.4
		This time restriction will also affect community initiatives by people who live further away being unable to attend as they won't be able to park. Even if they live further out in Clifton they need to drive to arrive on time.	3.4
355		Car use and the ability to park relatively freely are facilities that all sectors of society can make use of. The use of a vehicle adds to quality of life for all.	1
		To the resident or visitor to Clifton the proposals are Taxation and Harassment. The taxation aspect will fall heaviest on those least able to pay.	3.1.2
		Shoppers, young people with children and the elderly are not likely to use bicycles or motorbikes and would be particularly disadvantaged.	
		The proposals would make Clifton a less attractive place to live and work.	
		Shop traders in Clifton Village, who are mostly local, would inevitably suffer. Shoppers from out of Bristol would be discouraged by charges and harassment. Cribbs would be the beneficiary.	4.1
		The scheme would require a bureaucracy to administer.	3.1.1
		The streets would be cluttered with signs and yellow markings (in conservation areas).	4.1.5
		The scheme is undemocratic.	2
356		Works in Clifton and unfortunately there are no means of public transport from where they live.	4.3
		The proposals will also stop people shopping in Clifton if they cannot park near to the shops.	4.1
357		Understands the need to stop people parking there all day but the one hour parking limit will stop people going to Clifton Village and this will impact on businesses.	4.2
		Daughter attends Bristol School of Dance in Clifton Village and the one hour parking doesn't give enough time for the lessons and for getting changed. The lessons take place immediately after	

		<p>school and so would not have time to catch a bus.</p> <p>Parking should be allowed for at least two hours. People then have the time to spend money so they benefit the shops, restaurants and hairdressers.</p> <p>It is not possible for most people to use public transport. It is costly, unreliable and not practical when doing a week's shopping.</p>	4.5
358		<p>Identical to objection 352</p> <p>Commutes from South Wales into Clifton every day by car. The car is a company one and is essential for her to do her job. She travels from Clifton to companies to deliver HR and training and in addition to requiring use of the car throughout the day, is often carrying heavy boxes of training materials plus a laptop. It is therefore essential from a H&amp;S perspective that she has easy access to the car. She had a recent operation which makes it difficult to walk long distances or carrying heavy objects.</p>	4.1.4
359		<p>Finds the current parking a daily nightmare, desperate for the day that the RPS is introduced. Has been verbally abused, car has been spat on and my garage made inaccessible on a weekly basis due to people parking in front of the garage.</p> <p>It is not sustainable for traders and offices to expect to be able to commute to the area for free and lock out so many parking spaces for residents.</p> <p>The pressure on parking and being able to park in the road or nearby dictates how she lives her life as certain times of the day are impossible to find parking. Often has to carry bags of heavy shopping from long distances.</p> <p>Would also like to complain at the tactics of Clifton Traders endless door drops, stunts and odd world war 1 tanks which is pushing for the Village to be free to anyone outside Clifton to park in. Residents have not been considered at all. Clifton Village is not a free car park for customers and staff of the traders. Residents' needs must be considered.</p>	Comments noted
360		<p>Objects to the scheme but there have been two votes before where the residents' did not want the scheme. The majority of Clifton does not want the scheme. It is total abuse of the democratic principles of society.</p> <p>It is just a tax revenue raising exercise.</p> <p>It is going to reduce the amount of parking spaces.</p> <p>Households are not restricted to one permit per household so those with more cars will crowd out those with one car.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.5.2</p>

		The scheme will kill the thriving shops in the village.	4.1
361		Same points raised as objection 344.	
		Also says there is a lack of public transport serving the village.	4.5
		There has been no meaningful consultation and there is no democratic mandate for the proposal.	2
362		The consultation process was fast tracked and we missed a vital consultation phase which may have resulted in plans being better informed and therefore more equitable.	2.1.1
		We have inadequate transport links as the only alternative to driving a car is using the bus and there are only two services into the Village, therefore better transport links need to be in place before the implementation of RPS. There is also no car park in Clifton Village and no link to one.	4.5
		To enable businesses to function effectively there are not enough business permits on offer, particularly for employees who have no alternative but to drive to work, particularly in my business where we have to use our cars all day every day to transport clients around the area.	3.4
		Pay and display hours are insufficient; it will hamper trade and make our jobs virtually impossible. The longer 4+ hour parking is nearer the zoo and too far away and the number of spaces is grossly short of the current demand.	4.2
		The business support infrastructure is fragile and there is a clear misunderstanding of this. The larger employers on the periphery of the Village serve daily trade well and if they relocate to assist their businesses and employees trade will suffer, trade that is crucial to the sustainability of the area.	4.1.3
		At the moment Clifton Village is deemed to be a very sought after place to buy property because of its eclectic mix of shops, restaurants, cafes and businesses. This helps keep property buoyant thus supporting the overall sustainability of the village; if this changes so will the demand for property which has huge ramifications for the area.	1.4
		The six month review is not viable. Lack of footfall for small businesses will harm them quickly, the businesses will close and jobs will be lost.	6
363		It was a struggle to find a spot for my parents to park to help me unload my belongings but it was not a problem because once we did find a spot it was free and we enjoyed roaming round the village without anything stopping our enjoyment or costing us money. As a young professional where money is often tight yet more costs for myself, friends and family are not welcome.	1
364		It is apparent that proper account has not been taken of the needs of certain residents living in the immediate vicinity of Bristol Zoo and Clifton College – specifically residents of Northcote Road, who will be disadvantaged in terms of their basic parking needs, and also in comparison with other local residents, by arrangements for a residents' parking scheme as currently proposed.	3.3.2

		Residents are frequently denied a parking space altogether in our own road, or have to wait anything up to an hour for a space to become available. We are forced to drive around neighbouring streets looking for somewhere to park. Our fear is that if the parking scheme as proposed is implemented, this unacceptable situation could, far from being mitigated, become even worse.	3.3
		Since both the Zoo and the College hold numerous evening events, functions and meetings, the parking exasperation for residents regularly extends into the evening. Yet, despite all this, the parking restrictions proposed for Northcote Road are to operate until only 5pm and not at all on Saturday or Sundays. Competition for spaces is particularly severe at weekends, when both institutions continue to operate and when the Zoo is especially busy.	3.4
		There are, it is proposed, to be no spaces in Northcote Road designated for the use of residents only – in notable contrast to what is planned for Pembroke Road and the vicinity of the Cecil Road/College Road junction, directly opposite Northcote Road on the western side of the Zoo. This is despite the fact that most properties on Pembroke Road have off street parking.	3.3
		There are more than enough College personnel, contractors, visitors and parents to fill any and all available parking spaces on Northcote Road several times over throughout the week; many of these people, particularly the largest group which is Zoo visitors, will not be put off by parking charges which will in any case be a small fraction of the total cost of a Zoo visit.	3.3
		Drivers who are unable to park on Pembroke Road as a result of the residents-only designation will be displaced onto neighbouring roads which do offer paid for parking; this will consequently increase even more pressure on parking spaces in Northcote Road.	3.3
		It is irrational and unreasonable to propose or implement a residents' parking plan that does not fully take into account the impact of the proximity of Bristol Zoo and Clifton College when considering parking provision for residents of Northcote Road.	3.3
		Requests that amendments be made to rectify this prejudicial and inequitable situation by providing an appropriate number of parking spaces in Northcote Road for the use of residents only, from Monday to Saturday until 9pm each day as a minimum.	3.4
365		A resident of Northcote Road and has terrible spine issues and needs a car so it is imperative that she can park next to her flat.	3.3
		It is already a nightmare to park with the zoo visitors unwilling to pay £3 to park in the allocated zoo car park, endless school parents with large vehicles and school personnel taking up all the spaces.	3.3
		Understands that the surrounding roads will be given permits and be dedicated to residents only, although most of the properties have off street parking. This will in turn push all the visitors to the	3.3

		<p>area to park in the already overcrowded street causing more problems.</p> <p>It would only be fair to give the residents of Northcote Road parking permits. The road should be dedicated to residents only parking.</p> <p>The length of permitted time on the parking restrictions should also be reviewed and extended, not only as the zoo is obviously very popular during the weekend, Clifton College is open on Saturdays and both institutions hold functions during the evening causing parking mayhem for the residents.</p>	<p>3.5</p> <p>4.2</p>
366		<p>Extremely concerned that the proposed parking scheme will seriously affect their business and put children's lives at risk.</p> <p>Parents need to deliver their children safely to the pool for their lessons and if they cannot park a vehicle carrying the children near the pool while they attend the lessons they will stop attending. Whilst a lesson is 30 minutes long customers will need to park for about 60 minutes each time. Swimming teachers have to carry equipment to and from the pool to aid the teaching of swimming. The equipment is large and is difficult to transport to and from the pool. It certainly cannot be transported using public transport or using a bicycle.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>
367		<p>The Paragon is fairly narrow particularly between numbers 3 and 11, so that it would not accommodate parking on both sides of the road without cars being parked on the pavement and even this would make the road impassable for any larger vehicle such as ambulances and fire engines.</p> <p>The road from 1-15 is a quadrant and it is particularly difficult to reverse out of even with cars parked on one side of the road. Visitors inevitably collide with the pavement if not ride over it. It is therefore vital that a turning space is available at the end of the road.</p> <p>The pavement edge and gutters are a peculiar feature in that the gutters are constructed on a rise and fall basis to facilitate run off. This is an historic feature where damage should be avoided if possible.</p> <p>Parking on the pavement would be unacceptable for the following reasons. The pavement is for pedestrians and in particular those pushing prams so that it should not be obstructed. Most houses in the Paragon have rooms protruding under the pavement so that the superimposed weight of cars and other vehicles parked on the pavement could cause damage. Residents have paid contributions to install traditional paving stones and do not want these damaged by vehicles.</p> <p>I believe that the City's view is that it is up to residents of the Paragon to police their parking but as this is all public highway including the pavement no one has authority to do that and there would be no control over non-residents parking overnight. Therefore, it is vital that the double yellow lines as currently exist in the Paragon should remain.</p>	<p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p>
368		The suggested revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit	5.8



		<p>purchasing residents and businesses on Suspension Bridge Road.</p> <p>This measure defeats the aim of the scheme to improve the position for residents and is not necessary to meet BCC's stated aim of eradicating commuter parking.</p> <p>I urge BCC to reinstate Suspension Bridge Road as a shared pay and display/residents permit scheme in line with the original RPS proposals.</p>	
369		<p>It is ridiculous to introduce a parking scheme with such long hours.</p> <p>I work from home and I need visitors.</p> <p>I think we don't need any parking restrictions at all as it would make things worse.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>1.2</p>
370		<p>This is an undemocratic decision; most people she has spoken to opposes the scheme strongly.</p> <p>The proposals will destroy the livelihoods of a vast number of individuals reliant on the trade through Clifton. The Council will destroy one of the best places to eat, shop and drink in Bristol.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>4.1</p>
371		<p>Most of the houses on Royal York Crescent are composed of 5 or 6 flats and have several cars. The plans provide space for a small number of those. There will not be enough space at all.</p> <p>Suggests that if Royal York Crescent and York Gardens were both made one way, then both roads could have parking on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Clifton relies on visitors coming and spending several hours eating, drinking, shopping and meeting friends. If the CPZ plans go ahead it will ruin the area.</p> <p>Thinks Clifton works well as it is and the scheme will just ruin the area.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>1.4</p>
372		<p>Customers come from outside Bristol; they can spend a couple of hours initially designing and planning their project, in most cases they come back two to three times to finalise and order goods. The proposed scheme adds money onto their projected order as opposed to going to a free out of town location. They will not be able to park locally for that amount of time easily.</p> <p>The areas the Council are proposing will make it very difficult for lorries delivering to the shop, it is already difficult with the amount of invalid blue badge holders who park anywhere in the Village.</p> <p>The reduction of spaces will mean that workers getting there early for office hours will take all the available spaces, the reduction in spaces will mean nowhere to park.</p> <p>Not being able to park close to his business may mean that he has to move the business to a different location without restrictions.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.1</p>
373		Identical to objection 370.	

374		It will reduce the overall number of available spaces and make parking more difficult for friends and family.	3.3
375		<p>The proposals require significant change to make the scheme viable for long term trade within Clifton Village. These changes will require committed face to face consultation with representatives of both traders and residents.</p> <p>Restricted parking of the nature and times proposed in the scheme are not viable either for people coming into the Village to shop and eat.</p> <p>The restricted parking will not work for traders who either need to make frequent trips out of the village, or have employees who have no other way of getting into the Village due to very restricted public transport options and no car park facilities nearby.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>
376		<p>Has a drive way and is permitted to buy one permit. Diagonally opposite are two houses that have been converted into three flats each. None of these properties have off street parking so in theory each flat can purchase three permits making a total of 18 permits within fifty yards of our house whereas we are going to be allowed to have just one. This is quite clearly unfair and illogical. Each house should have the option to purchase two permits.</p> <p>The hours of operation have been extended to run from 9am-9pm Monday to Saturday but there was no consultation on this. This will hugely affect the local village businesses. Parking in the early evening is not generally a problem in Clifton Village once commuters have left. The hours of operation should be the same across Clifton and finish at 6pm or 7pm.</p> <p>Local businesses will shut or move elsewhere and Clifton will be left with beautiful architecture but not much else. Residents would then have to drive to go out in the evening to other parts of Bristol.</p>	<p>3.5</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1</p>
377		<p>The proposal for Suspension Bridge Road has been changed so that the north side of the road will not be available for residents to park but solely for metered parking. This will undoubtedly make parking much more difficult.</p> <p>Wishes to register their objection to the proposal which appears to discriminate against the residents rather than assist them.</p>	5.8
378		<p>Objects to the revised RPS proposal implementing a pay and display only on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road.</p> <p>If introduced, the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents and businesses of Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings by reducing the number of parking spaces available to residents and businesses by half.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p>

		<p>This measure defeats the aim of the scheme, which to improve the position for residents, and is not necessary to meet the stated aim of eradicating commuter parking.</p> <p>Urges this to be looked at again and for the shared pay and display/residents permit bays to be reinstated in line with the original proposals.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>5.8</p>
379		<p>Has previously objected to this scheme as a substantial number of cars will be displaced onto the Downs, spoiling an iconic public space bequeathed to the residents of Bristol.</p> <p>Objects on the basis of the negative impact it will have on the many independent traders in the Village. The restrictions will put off the many visitors who currently 'pop in.' Fewer visitors will inevitably mean the closure of many entrepreneurial shops.</p>	<p>5.2</p> <p>4.1</p>
380		<p>The proposals on parking bays around the shops of one hour do not give sufficient time for people to shop, browse or make proper use of the local services. The pay and display should be increased to at least two hours.</p> <p>The proposals for parking restrictions is 9am-9pm. This should be changed to 9am-7pm. This enables residents who work more standard hours to more easily find parking at their home, yet still enables evening visitors to park after 7pm without concern and restrictions.</p> <p>In many areas the transport infrastructure has not been upgraded sufficiently to enable viable alternatives to many who currently use their cars to drive to work. Developing a better integrated transport network needs to be implemented prior to, or in line with, other initiatives such as the RPS.</p> <p>Moved to Clifton knowing that parking was on occasions going to be burdensome, but also knew that there was an excellent, eclectic atmosphere in the hub of Clifton Village. He would not wish to trade improved parking opportunities at the expense of 'village life'.</p> <p>Asks what the measures of success of the scheme will be.</p> <p>If there is a downturn of trade in Clifton shops as a result of RPS, will the RPS be reassessed? If so, what time period is in place?</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>6</p> <p>6</p>
381		Identical to objection 378.	
382		<p>Needs to be able to park reasonably close to his flat due to his age and medical condition. The number of parking bays available will drop which will force him to park further away and walk further with heavy loads. States that the residents need more parking spaces not fewer.</p> <p>Many of their neighbours are also pensioners. As a pensioner, they are on a limited fixed income,</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.1</p>

		<p>and any charge for parking will mean a cut to other spending. If there are charges, there should be a special free rate exemptions for pensioners over 60 years of age. We need our cars to go to medical and other appointments and to remain independent.</p> <p>These new parking proposals will not solve the parking problems in Clifton. People won't sell their cars. New problems will be created as residents move their cars into neighbouring areas, creating new congestion.</p> <p>Clifton attracts huge numbers of visitors and like any other tourist destination it should have a dedicated car park which would be charged for.</p> <p>There doesn't seem to be any local support for this scheme as it stands. It is not democratic. We need to carry out a proper study on parking trends in the area after a car park has been open for a couple of years.</p>	<p>5.2</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>2</p>
383		Identical to objection 382.	
384		Re-affirms their 100% support for the Clifton Village RPS.	Comments noted
385		Concerned that the proposed time limit of 1 hour for paid parking in Clifton Village will adversely affect the businesses there. For example restaurants and coffee shops and as a knock on from that other businesses will lose custom from ad hoc shoppers.	4.2
386		<p>The scheme as proposed is too restrictive. We acknowledge the need for a scheme to control commuter parking but consider this could be achieved with one or two one hour controlled periods during the working day, as used successfully by many other local authorities.</p> <p>Cannot understand the need for a scheme which extends to 9pm during the week and on Saturdays. There is no problem parking after 6pm on a weekday or at weekends. Controlling parking after 6pm or on Saturdays would have a serious detrimental effect on Clifton Village and on Christ Church's ability to operate at its current level of activity.</p> <p>Most of their large volunteer workforce, and indeed our paid staff cannot afford to live in Clifton and so have to travel in from cheaper parts of Bristol or beyond.</p> <p>The scheme as proposed seems skewed towards the needs of residents (even the name RPZ hints at this). Clifton Village is not exclusively residential but is a mixed area of residential, business, community, shops, restaurants, tourism and leisure. Other local authorities have CPZs which aim to balance the needs of all users. The proposed scheme seems to ignore the unique nature of Clifton Village.</p>	<p>3.4.4</p> <p>3.4.5</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>1.3</p>

	<p>The Council are now proposing a mixture of one, two and three hour bays which is very concerning. The 3 hour maximum length of stay is not long enough for the activities ran by the Church – especially on Saturdays and the evenings. We have previously asked for 5 hour bays but this request has been ignored.</p>	4.2
	<p>There are no public car parks close to Clifton and we are concerned that the scheme will leave inadequate public parking facilities to cope with the number of attendees at a Saturday wedding, evening course or mid-week funeral.</p>	3.3.2
	<p>Experience of other RPS's show that during the controlled hours a large proportion of the resident only bays will be left empty. This is simply not a good use of a valuable and limited resource.</p>	1.4
	<p>The majority of staff at Christ Church live 5-10 miles away and have to work antisocial hours pre 8am or leave late post 10pm.</p>	Noted
	<p>Public transport links to Clifton are very limited and the wider bus network is some walk away. The experience of our staff who have attempted to use public transport is that it is expensive, slow and unreliable.</p>	4.5
	<p>Aside from the introduction of a park and ride service from Long Ashton, there are no other proposals to improve the frequency or reliability of the existing bus provision, or provide additional services which connect Clifton to anywhere outside of route 8 or 9.</p>	4.5
	<p>The provision of the bus service until 7pm each evening seems contrary to the proposed timings of the RPS which operate until 9pm.</p>	4.5.3
	<p>The proposal to park outside of the RPS and cycle/walk/bus in simply moves the problem out of Clifton to another area.</p>	1
	<p>Until there is significant investment in public transport, it is not a viable alternative to using the car.</p>	4.5
	<p>The cost of £140 per permit is still too expensive. We are aware of one local authority (London Borough of Ealing) which offers a charity based permit for just £30 making them much more affordable.</p>	3.2.1
	<p>We request that the borderline between the 5 day and 6 day week controlled areas is reconsidered so that the streets surrounding Christ Church are all within the 5 day (9-5) controlled area. We suggest that the Suspension Bridge Road would make an adequate alternative border.</p>	5.2
	<p>The road outside Christ Church Crypt on Clifton Down has been marked as double yellow lines. We</p>	5.17

		ask that these be removed, as we often use this space and access the drive.	
387		<p>To enforce time restrictions of 9am-9pm will only cause problems for the residents as there are no extra permits/visitors' permits to compensate. This will have a significant impact on the contentment of the residents and not only effect home owners but tenants looking to rent will not go near these areas and will have a massive negative affect on local shops and lead to more local shopping areas closing down.</p> <p>We will be forced to use two, three, four times more visitor passes and would assume we have to pay the same for them as others in less restrictive areas and are not receiving extra to compensate. Although compensation of extra visitor passes is not the answer to this completely unreasonable enforcement. This type of enforcement will not only make all residents in the area unhappy and significantly affect their quality of life but they will be forced to have to live differently and live by the time enforcements and whether or not they can afford passes.</p> <p>Understands the standard 9am-5pm and would be willing to accept this, but does not know why or has not read why the southern half should be penalised with 4 extra hours of restricted parking, with no factual, statistical or even sensible common sense in suggesting so excessive time restrictions.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.4</p>
388		<p>Objects to the proposed parking restrictions on the basis that the street is both residential and business. The number of residents who have no off street parking at all is far greater than residents who have some off street parking.</p> <p>The plans for Waterloo Street propose no residential parking with only 1 hour metered parking up to 9pm Monday to Saturday is bizarre when all the shops close at 5:30pm.</p> <p>The previous version of these plans that allowed residents and visitors to share the parking seems a much more sensible option.</p> <p>As for the visitors both private and business only being able to park for one hour, it will simply not allow them to enjoy the full experience of Clifton Village and will probably damage business sales.</p>	<p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.2</p>
389		<p>Restrictions in other parts of Clifton are only between the hours of 9am-5pm, yet the restrictions on Richmond Hill will be extended to 9pm. This will have a serious impact on our business. Due to the nature of the business we are not a 9 to 5 organisation and regularly have meetings outside these often extending into the early evening.</p> <p>Residents' family members often call at our premises to discuss their care or pay bills. Quite often these visits are early evening as there is nowhere to park during the day. As an organisation we would be unable to give visitor permits to every visitor who entered our premises as it could amount to several visitors per day. We do have a car park at our premises but due to staffing levels this has to be kept for employees.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6 3.7</p>

390		<p>Opposed to the scheme as one hour parking limits in the centre of the village will hamper trade and the four hour parking is too far away to be of any use.</p> <p>It is also very problematic for employees going to work in the Village who do not have any alternative forms of transport.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.4</p>
391		<p>Needs her car to get to work otherwise she would be required to take two buses to get to work. Transport links are inadequate.</p> <p>Her family visit the village to go to shops, restaurants and salons, an hour is not long enough to do these activities.</p> <p>The number of business permits is too low.</p> <p>There is a lack of understanding regarding the fragile business support structure.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
392		<p>Relies on parking on street in order to get to work as there is no feasible and cost effective alternative from the Chippenham area. To date, this has worked well – there are always spaces and no-one is inconvenienced by them parking on the street.</p> <p>Bristol City Council have given no reasons to convince them that the scheme is nothing but another money making scheme.</p> <p>It is ludicrous that public transport is stated to improve when demand increases. This is an illogical way to implement such a massively inconvenient scheme as there will be a transition phase where people are left with absolutely no options.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.6</p>
393		<p>The scheme is not in the interests of Bristol as a city as it is just going to make it harder for people to work and visit.</p> <p>Works at the University of Bristol and parking is already restricted. If the scheme comes in it will be increasingly difficult to get to work. Has to drive in as public transport from where they live would be too expensive and time-consuming to use public transport. The suggestion that public transport will improve as demand increases is unacceptable and shows a complete lack of foresight or care about how this will affect people. Plans for improvements should be in place already. Bristol City Council is forcing these parking schemes in all over the City without listening to public opinion.</p> <p>States that they will no longer use the shops in Clifton if pay and display parking is brought in and believes that this will discourage many people from shopping in Clifton. Does not feel that the reasons given in the proposals are enough to justify bringing in pay and display over limited waiting parking.</p> <p>Believes that the scheme is being brought in purely to make money and will only make life harder for residents and employees in Bristol.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.1.1</p>

394		<p>Does not think the parking zone will achieve anything good for residents or visitors. Residents will have more difficulty as some spaces will be given over to pay &amp; display only. It is an unwelcome tax. The only way to improve the parking situation is explore creating additional parking.</p> <p>Visitors will have to pay or the people they are coming to see will have to pay for them. His daughter lives in the village and this will make it more difficult to visit her by car.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>3.6</p>
395		<p>They have an electric car and another car that is band F and ask whether the electric car can have its own permit given that it has zero emissions. They are limited to one permit but they have to have off street parking as it is essential for the purpose of charging the electric car. It is sometimes necessary to park the electric car on the street when the off-street parking is blocked by parked cars despite double yellow lines.</p> <p>Supports the cleared spaces in front of the steps enabling pedestrians to gain access to and from the raised pavement of Prince's Buildings without having to negotiate around parked cars. Currently people risk life and limb wheeling bicycles or prams down the more difficult steps at the end of Prince's Buildings or walk along the road with the pram and toddlers because they could not get up those steps.</p> <p>Requests that the double yellow lines in the Paragon are retained to protect the garages opposite numbers 1-3. The garages need the protections of double yellow lines from permit holders who will otherwise believe that they are entitled to park where there is no obvious restriction on them. Permit holders will not be deterred from parking where there is a dropped kerb.</p> <p>The Paragon is one of the very few streets between the nucleus of the CPZ and the edge of the parking zone. Pressure on places will be even greater than at present because the emptier streets beyond the boundary will no longer be available to Clifton Village permit holders who live in these very densely populated streets.</p> <p>When a vehicle does obstruct access to the garages, your own officers would not be able to take any action unless the obstructing vehicle is parked on double yellow lines or it does not have a permit. If your officers cannot take enforcement action the police may remove the obstructing vehicle, but only access on to the highway. If the offending vehicle is blocking access into the garage police will not act.</p> <p>If the garage user is blocked out of the off street parking they will not be able to park in a permit bay without incurring enforcement themselves.</p> <p>One of the cars that uses the garages is electric and access to the garages is essential for overnight refuelling purposes. Without the warning effect and enforcement power of the double yellow lines it will be very difficult to continue using this type of vehicle.</p>	<p>3.5</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>Noted</p>



		<p>The double yellow lines in front of the garages in conjunction with the double yellow lines in front of numbers 1-3 The Paragon provide enough space for vehicles to turn.</p> <p>The yellow lines in front of 1-3 also provide enough space to manoeuvre in and out of the garages and the ability to access the garages.</p> <p>Further obstruction by cars parked opposite the garages will increase the risk of collision.</p> <p>Says one hour parking is not long enough.</p> <p>Shared use bays will be taken up by permit holders' who do not want to use the pay &amp; display near the shops. They will not be subject to the same time limits, therefore taking spaces away from people who need to use the pay &amp; display.</p> <p>Parking metres are unwelcoming, wasteful and unnecessary. Metres manufactured in France and then transported over are not very environmentally friendly (which is a scheme aim); the council should be thinking about Bristol's Green Capital status. Cashless parking requires much less street furniture and works well in other parts of the city. Or the European Standard Parking Disc is much friendlier and doesn't require any money but still limits the time that people can park.</p> <p>The scheme is about revenue raising.</p> <p>The area has many attractions, offices, schools, shops etc but no car park and only four bus stops. Other improvements need to be made first.</p> <p>The number of spaces is being seriously reduced. Vulnerable adults may be forced to walk further distances home late at night, especially those that live in the CPZ.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>4.2.3</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>1.2, 1.3, 1.4</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
396		<p>These proposals are unfair, and more importantly, seem to be being advanced without correct and due consultation with residents and local businesses.</p> <p>If the genuine reason for the proposals is to make parking easier for residents and businesses, then permits for these groups should clearly be free. The payment for a permit is unfair, and provides no guarantee whatsoever of actually acquiring a parking place.</p> <p>It will harm businesses, particularly restaurants and cafes (which are so much of Clifton Village's life blood). It will also make it very difficult for friends and relatives to visit residents.</p> <p>It is essential these objections are listened to and taken on board.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>2.2</p>
397		<p>Having received the leaflet concerning parking zones for Clifton, I would like to politely disagree that the scheme is going to be unhelpful for residents. It is impossible to park anywhere near my home at present. So the leaflet is quite wrong in asserting that we 'already have' spaces and that we should</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>

		<p>therefore not have to pay for what we already 'have.'</p> <p>Secondly, there are too many cars in Clifton. This may be good for business; it is certainly unpleasant and often treacherous for pedestrians.</p> <p>I hear a lot of people saying they are against the parking scheme about to trail: I cannot understand why more people are not concerned with the level of traffic and therefore pollution in Clifton as things are.</p> <p>It is impossible, increasingly, for residents to park anywhere near where they live. In Richmond Terrace one is obliged to park at the top of Richmond Lane to unpack a car.</p> <p>I hear much about businesses due to suffer as a result of restricted parking, what about resident's needs?</p>	
398		<p>It is occasionally necessary to have a car to carry all the equipment that is needed to do her job safely.</p> <p>Runs evening courses which take place in the Zoo. For these events she works a full day and does not finish until after 9:30pm. It is not safe to be walking to Horfield in the dark, especially in the winter. There is no direct bus to Horfield at this time as the 505 service finishes at 7pm. This would mean getting a bus to the centre and then back out – a round trip of an hour late at night.</p> <p>She gives talks to community groups across the City and further afield. To do this she needs to take heavy equipment; it is not practical to go home to Horfield to get the car and then go to another location in the City to give a talk.</p> <p>A wide range of groups visit the Downs for guided walks this includes a group of older people with dementia and a group of refugees. Parking restrictions around Clifton Village may mean that groups like this will not visit in the future because of the costs involved with parking.</p> <p>They rely on volunteers to support their education sessions. They do this work for free, so parking charges and bus fares would be prohibitive for them.</p> <p>They have to pay experts who lead their walks and so must charge participants. The additional cost of parking will reduce the number of participants attending and make the walks unviable or at the very least only accessible to those who are well off.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1</p>
399		<p>There is no need to introduce a Residents' Parking Scheme at all. Residents in Clifton have access to off road parking in many instances and as they work, have on street parking at night when they need it.</p> <p>He will be forced to park elsewhere in North Bristol therefore just moving the parking congestion</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>5.2</p>

		elsewhere in the City.	
		He will also have to walk from his car to work which in winter will be in the dark and for female employees will be a significant detriment if not outright dangerous.	4.4
400		What difference would it make to bring this scheme in? The permit is from 9am-5pm, is this aimed for people who do not work? Because I certainly do not need to park my car in these hours.	3.4
		Understands if the permit was for 24 hours and then it might be worth the money, but why should I pay for a permit when I would be in actually same position as I am now?	3.1.1
		Feel like if it is brought in I will be forced to buy one 'just in case' I need to park in those hours otherwise it would mean parking in St Pauls and walking home.	3.4
401		I have always been of the belief that any restrictions in parking are not necessary.	1
		Footfall has reduced drastically in recent years resulting in difficult business conditions and causing me to give serious consideration if it is viable to remain here.	4.1
		Many of my customers come from outside Bristol, to see the shops, visit a cafe, or restaurant and see the sights. This takes more than one hour.	4.2
		Lack of sufficient public transport, park and ride and especially any thought of utilising unused space i.e. the Promenade for a proper paid car park.	4.5
402		The proposed permit scheme is completely unnecessary and overboard in terms of the regulations it would impose. Overly strict parking permits will cause much hassle for the people of Clifton going about their day to day lives. The lively buzz that is brought to Clifton at weekends is a defining feature of the area and bringing in such strict regulation is highly compromising to this.	1
403		Objects to the proposed pay & display parking outside 6 Gordon Road. TRO 1340 has just been implemented after being sealed in October 2013. The 15 minutes free parking there was a planning condition for the nursery.	5.16
		The new pay & display will allow people to park there for up to one hour. People will use it for shopping in the village or Whiteladies Road. If parents cannot park at the nursery they will go elsewhere meaning another business loses out and children lose out on their education.	
404		Absolutely opposes the one hour parking time. One hour does not allow people to meet friends for lunch, go to the hairdresser or to browse the shops.	4.2
		There is no alternative to driving a car to Clifton as public transport is not adequate.	4.5
		Consultation has been too fast and there has been no consultation at the start of the process.	2
		The number of work permits needs to be increased.	4.3

405	<p>Objects to the scheme because it will reduce local trade, it will make independent shops unviable, store chains will move in and the character of the area will change making it a less attractive place to live.</p> <p>They let their basement flat out on a short term basis and this will make it a less attractive let.</p> <p>There is a lack of transparency. If the council are sure it is a cost effective solution then show the calculations.</p> <p>Installing pay &amp; display machines is expensive. The number and locations of the machines has not been advertised and he does not want one outside his grade 2 listed home. Most of Clifton is like this.</p> <p>The entire village should be shared use so that empty spaces during the day can be used by visitors.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
406	<p>Objects to the fact that the scheme will run 9am-9pm Monday to Saturday rather 9am-5pm Monday to Friday.</p> <p>Understands that residents in the southern half will not receive any additional visitors' permits, which seems highly unreasonable given that a majority of visitors are likely to visit in the evenings or at weekends.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p>
407	<p>Fully aware of the fragility of the public support and footfall, any slight change which involves parking restrictions and payments will hurt these smaller shops and will result in closures and re-locations.</p>	<p>4.1</p>
408	<p>Would like to express their objection to the plans which are utterly ludicrous and will kill off business in Clifton. Parking at present is difficult for shoppers and with the planned restrictions trade will be unsustainable.</p> <p>In poor weather or when there are time constraints, they have to drive to their place of work in Regent Street. Wants to know what they're supposed to do, and how they can obtain a permit for parking near their workplace.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.4</p>
409	<p>We welcome and support the plan for double yellow lines outside _____ and believe when implemented the road will be improved.</p> <p>We believe that it is essential to have double yellow lines outside _____ to allow access to the drive. If cars park either side of the drive we cannot use the driveway.</p> <p>Current parking outside _____ is partially on the pavement, which makes it unsafe for pedestrians and still prevents use of the driveway.</p>	<p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.6</p>
410	<p>To have ugly pay and display machines plus parking signs and restrictions everywhere would be very off putting to visitors and detrimental to this area as a tourist attraction and beloved home that is known world-wide for its beautiful views and landmarks.</p>	<p>4.1.5</p>

		<p>Residents have not been considered enough in the plans for the parking proposals, as we need to park near our homes and won't have chance to as the evening parking is now even more limited due to the proposed scheme.</p>	3.3
		<p>How are residents supposed to manage when they have visitors maybe staying for the weekend and need to park for longer periods of time?</p>	3.6
		<p>There are a lot of people with carers visiting two or three times a day, this should be considered.</p>	3.7
		<p>A lovely play area is now being erected, but people will be put off the idea as it will either cost them a small fortune in time and money transporting the children to the village, or if they are lucky to get a parking space it will cost them a lot of money and then they still will be kept to a time that they need to be back to move their vehicles.</p>	4.1
		<p>Suffers from agoraphobia and being able to park close to her property and only have a short walk from the car to the front door is a key part of recovery. If she were to feel vulnerable or frightened then her daughter would no longer be able to come to her aid and park with ease.</p>	3.3
		<p>The proposed parking permits for this area are going to be marginally more expensive than other areas, which is extremely unfair as it is not the case that everyone is wealthy in Clifton. This assumption is unacceptable and prejudiced.</p>	3.1.4
		<p>If the proposed reduction of spaces on Royal York Crescent goes ahead then it will make it even harder for the people that live there to find a space when it is almost impossible already.</p>	5.5
411		<p>The plan does not allocate designated parking for the residents. There have been some challenging moments for parking especially during peak zoo times but it is generally possible to find a space, now we are being asked to pay for exactly the same treatment.</p>	3.3.2
		<p>Given the fact that Pembroke, College and Cecil Roads will be entirely restricted to residents only, we can now expect commuters who would normally park on those roads to find the loophole of Northcote, and then the road will be blocked beyond all recognition.</p>	3.3.2
		<p>It is grossly unfair for the above mentioned roads to have resident only parking, provided that most residents have off street parking.</p>	3.3.2
		<p>As Council tax payers, soon to pay additionally for parking, we are surely entitled to the same benefits enjoyed by our immediate neighbours. We are sandwiched between two rather large institutions which makes it somewhat essential that our present possibilities of parking should be continued.</p>	3.3.2
412		<p>Feels that the current plans are not workable and significant change is required before they will be deliverable.</p>	5.4

		<p>Concerned about the small number of customer permits which will make it impossible for the college to carry out its business.</p> <p>Restrictions on Saturdays will affect the courses run.</p> <p>Public transport links are inadequate.</p> <p>Initial consultation was not carried out.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.5</p>
413		<p>It is a lengthy process to be given a permit. The chances of a student houses being awarded in time for the academic year are slim.</p> <p>The transport system in Bristol is appalling, buses highly unreliable and expensive, and a 20 minute journey can last an hour.</p> <p>There are also more than one car in a house, the number of flats in Clifton is very high and the chances of there being more than one car a household is also very high. Thus the chances of everyone being awarded a permit in the household is unlikely, causing inconvenience to those who don't get one.</p> <p>The zones do not allow any visitors for any residents within the time slot.</p> <p>There are a lot of people who work in Clifton, where are these people supposed to park on arrival to work.</p> <p>It will make it much harder for people to drive into Clifton village and to the various pubs and bars around if people are not able to park anywhere near due to the restrictions.</p> <p>Introducing the parking zones will cause great inconvenience to both residents and employers in the area.</p>	<p>2.2.3</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1</p>
414		<p>The proposed scheme should include free limited hours parking in the village so that the independent shops are not harmed by the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The village has a unique atmosphere within Bristol and needs to be protected. Nowhere else can you find such a collection of independent shops, restaurants and other businesses which would be irreparably damaged by their customers not being able to park nearby.</p> <p>There is very little viable options other than to drive to the Clifton area.</p>	<p>4.1.2</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.5</p>
415		<p>A restriction of one hour in Clifton Village will have a negative impact on many businesses which employ a great number of people and attract huge investment to the area as a whole.</p>	<p>4.2</p>

		<p>Concerned what the restrictions will mean for the many teachers and staff employed by schools in Clifton – many of whom work unsociable hours and can't rely on the poor bus services.</p> <p>The proposed amends to the coach drop off zones in Guthrie Road will now mean that there is no safe place for the 1000+ children at Clifton College to be dropped off and picked up for Games. The new proposed scheme will put children's lives at risk. Just because we pay for our children's education, it should not mean that the Council has any less of a duty of care to ensure road safety in the vicinity of their school.</p> <p>The lack of investment in reliable, affordable public transport alternatives ahead of the introduction of this scheme will have a huge impact on the areas outside the RPS as commuters compete for parking.</p> <p>The consultation does not seem to have been fair or properly run.</p> <p>Work is already underway to implement the new restrictions on the roads involved -before the consultation period is even complete. This reflects the fact that the council never had any intention to respond or take on board any of the feedback it received via the consultation. This is completely out of line with consultation best practise.</p> <p>The 100% opposition to the proposals shown at the recent meeting at Clifton High, plus marching through the City by those concerned about the proposals, demonstrate that in their current form these proposals are not right and further debate and proper consultation is needed with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Despite the fact that my business has been based in Clifton since it was started by the previous owners over 40 years ago, I am now considering moving to North Somerset. I doubt that mine will be the only business to do so.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>4</p>
416		<p>My children go to school in Clifton and we need to drive to school because of where we live. I regularly volunteer to help in the classrooms between 9 and 10 and the new scheme would make it difficult to do this.</p> <p>The five hour maximum parking time would mean that I would be unable to help with all day school trips.</p>	4
417		<p>Every independent business in Clifton has worked hard to draw customers to the village but the Council seem to be working against us by making it an undesirable place to visit. One hour parking bays are just not good enough.</p> <p>We do not have a problem with commuters taking the spaces. It is the amount of businesses and houses that are in the area that cause problems. The majority of the five storey houses have been made into flats, with at least one or two cars to a flat.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.1.2</p>

		<p>Many of the offices in Clifton have numerous members of staff who have to drive to work because the buses that run to the area are insufficient, infrequent and unreliable.</p> <p>It seems more prudent to build a car park to cater for the demands of the customers and employees of Clifton or a car park under the Downs. More buses or trams around Bristol would be environmentally friendly and economically viable.</p> <p>The best solution would be to use the Park and Ride system. At the moment the buses do not come up to Clifton but if they did they would be used. She lives in North Somerset and would definitely use the Long Ashton Park and Ride if there were a stop in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.5.1</p> <p>4.5.2</p>
418		<p>I have found that, usually, the worst time to park is late at night because of the limited space for parking.</p> <p>The proposals do not maximise the amount of parking there could be without causing obstruction. This should be done and could be done. I don't like having to walk long distances late at night.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.3</p>
419		<p>Why must there be a limited number of visitors passes for residents? This makes it difficult for people to come to my house and for my family who come to see me and help me when I need it.</p> <p>If visitors pay on the meter they will be restricted according to the relevant parking meter which as you explain will be dependent on the location. This is complex and will put friends off.</p> <p>Gradually the Council has noticeably reduced its parking spaces and increased housing with no thought of the outcome other than to force people to pay money for the right to park their cars where they live.</p>	<p>3.6</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.3</p>
420		<p>Objects to the scheme as does not believe it will reach any useful objective.</p> <p>Commuters and local workers make up a large amount of the trade in the village each day. This will drive the businesses out and this is self-destructive.</p> <p>Only two bus routes serve Clifton and only from the city centre. This is not adequate when staff live all over and around the city. Improving public transport and better commuter parking facilities should come first.</p> <p>The scheme is short sighted; it will only serve people who are not at work during the day.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1</p>
421		<p>Does not believe that there is a need for this scheme and can only assume that it is designed to be revenue generating for the Council at the expense of local businesses and residents. Has rarely struggled to park within close proximity of his property.</p> <p>The plan for Royal York Crescent shows on side of the street to be 'no waiting at any time'; this is ludicrous as currently one side of the street allows approximately 30 cars to park. Removing this side</p>	<p>1</p> <p>5.5</p>



		<p>of the street as an option for residents to park will have the opposite effect to the stated aims of the scheme.</p> <p>Royal York Crescent does not need restrictions to be in place until 9pm. The available parking does not currently change on this street regardless of time of day making it unfair on the residents and their guests to restrict parking until this time.</p> <p>Asks whether they will receive an increased number of visitor permits to compensate for this increased restriction. The proposal restricts his partner to visiting once a week unless he purchases more visitors' permits.</p> <p>This scheme will cost residents more than other areas of Bristol. This is not fair as they already pay higher Council tax. They will be paying for something that they already have (parking) but without a guarantee that they will be able to get it.</p> <p>Businesses should not pay more for the right to park at their place of work.</p> <p>Clifton is what it is because of the many small businesses that operate in the area; the scheme will drive them away. Placing restrictions on the visitors to the area will impact on these businesses heavily and risk the future of the area. Clifton thrives on visitors wondering around the shops and stopping for lunch/coffee; this is not possible in one hour. The fact that Sundays are not included sums up how ill thought out the proposal is – there is no difference to Clifton Village on any day of the week, the same shops and restaurants are open every day.</p> <p>Permit costs should not be linked to vehicle excise duty. This is already covered by vehicle road tax, to include these categories within a parking scheme is a double tax, a car is a car and each one despite the engine emissions takes up the same space.</p> <p>I note with interest that the proposed Clifton East scheme only has restrictions 9am-5pm are there no bars or restaurants on Whiteladies, which is the stated reason that Clifton Village restrictions are proposed until 9pm.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>5.1</p>
422		<p>These measures will only serve to stifle movement around the area and this will ruin business within the area. The whole feel of a thriving community will be destroyed.</p> <p>We have been asked in opinion polls a number of times if we want parking controls on a number of occasions. The Council has clearly been told every time that we do not want this. The Council is supposed to be representing the people of Bristol and has a responsibility to take notice of our opinions.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>1.2</p>
423		<p>Objects to the proposed one hour pay and display to be implemented in Clifton Village and the extremely limited number of pay and display bays in Clifton area.</p>	<p>4.2</p>

		One hour is simply not enough to go shopping and have lunch with friends.	4.2
		Public transport is not option for us (and most others) except for an expensive taxi ride. The parking restrictions will make us meet elsewhere and shop elsewhere thus depriving shop owners of our business.	4.5
424		<p>The removal of the yellow lines will mean that we cannot reliably get into or out of our garage/parking space. As well as being a serious inconvenience it will at times leave us in the unavoidable position of having to park a car without a permit on the street.</p> <p>With the proposed scheme reducing parking spaces in an area that already has more cars than available spaces the pressure to park in an uncivilised manner will be intense – particularly so as people will not unreasonably assume we have elected against having protective double yellow lines. What purpose can there be to go to the expense of removing double yellows that protect off-road spaces when there is no possible gain except that people can 'legally' park in an obstructive manner?</p> <p>The TOC definition of a Permit Parking Area includes 'whereby the parts of unrestricted road within are designated as a parking place' which definition clearly envisages restrictions co-existing with a PPA.</p>	5.6
425		<p>Objects to the revised RPS proposal implementing a pay and display only area on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. If introduced the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents and businesses of Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings by reducing the number of parking spaces available by half.</p> <p>Also concerned that BCC has not afforded residents a reasonable opportunity to respond to these significantly revised proposals. BCC has not written to residents inviting any comment (e.g. by postcard as it did previously), and has permitted only a limited three week period within which to respond.</p>	5.6
426		<p>Wanting to impose a restricted parking zone will kill this beautiful part of Bristol. It will cause irreparable damage to businesses and to the way people live in the Village.</p> <p>It will drive people to the outskirts of the city or even worse to another city like Swindon.</p>	4.1
427		<p>Feels that this would have a negative effect on the community, which would be difficult to rectify. Receives numerous visitors throughout the week both socially and for business and these restrictions will severely reduce their desire to visit Clifton.</p> <p>In this economic climate it is important to support local businesses. I worry that not only will this be a severe inconvenience to residents it will be detrimental to local business.</p>	3.6 4.1
428		The plan fails to indicate which permit holders will be allowed to park in The Paragon. In the remainder of this and the other plans, the permit holders allowed to park are to be limited to local residents. Why have you seen fit to open The Paragon to every permit holder in Clifton, including	5.6

		<p>local businesses? We object to what appears to be deliberate discrimination against those living in The Paragon.</p> <p>The plan envisages removing the double yellow lines along the left hand side of The Paragon after the bay at the entrance for 3 cars and the turning circle at the end. If you envisage residents parking on both sides of The Paragon, may we point out that such parking would be possible only if the cars concerned mounted on the pavement. This would severely limit the width of the street. Delivery vehicles, fire engines, refuse carts and ambulances would almost certainly not be able to go beyond the entrance of The Paragon.</p> <p>Residents of the Paragon will not allow parking on the pavement. The pavement in The Paragon in front of the houses numbered 1 to 15 is on the top of cellars. These cellars were constructed between 1800 and 1830 when the weight of current vehicles would not have been envisaged</p>	
429		Objects to the revised RPS proposal implementing a pay and display only area on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. If introduced the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents and businesses of Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings by reducing the number of parking spaces available by half.	5.8
430		<p>It would be a retrograde step to make no waiting restriction to the north right side of Clifton Park Road. We need more parking spaces made available, not less.</p> <p>Runs a salon. Currently clients often drive around for 30 or more minutes looking for a space. One hour parking is not enough as many visits take a few hours.</p> <p>We are not going to stop people using their cars but it will be a considerable frustration for residents and visitors alike trying to find somewhere to park.</p>	<p>5.11</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>1</p>
431		<p>The proposals fail to consider the views of commuters who work in the Clifton area, particularly those who live outside of Bristol and where public transport, cycling and walking is not a suitable or practical alternative.</p> <p>There is already a lack of alternative and affordable all day car parking in this area. There is also a lack of suitable and affordable public transport options connecting the main bus/transport routes in and out of Bristol.</p> <p>The RPS will have a detrimental effect on local shops and businesses. It will encourage shoppers to use alternative out of town shops and businesses, which offer free unrestricted parking.</p> <p>Commuters who currently park in the streets in this area also make use of local shops, businesses, restaurants etc on their way to and from work. If commuters are no longer able to park in these areas, local businesses and shops will no longer benefit from the additional business this brings to the area.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.1.3</p>

		It would seem that work has already started in the Clifton Village area to implement the scheme, as work to lay out the road markings for the new parking restrictions has already begun. This would suggest that any objections to the scheme are unlikely to be considered.	2.2.3
432		<p>Parking in the area can be difficult to find at various times of the day, but if you start charging by meters and causing car parkers to move around the area more frequently you are going to create further difficulties for people who are residents in this area.</p> <p>My son, who is the car driver in our house, has the added concern of my own age, which necessitates his keeping our car as near as possible to our front door, as I am now infirm and occasionally in need of urgent attention, should I fall inside the house.</p>	1.2
433		<p>Clifton relies on the free parking to get attract custom. The parking restrictions destroyed Whiteladies Road. Whiteladies Road is really run down, do you really want to do that to Clifton Village?</p> <p>Visitor Permits and parking permits aren't good enough as it doesn't bring other people into Clifton and the visitor permits won't allow for enough visits.</p> <p>The relaxed Village environment will leave Clifton Village and rather than people browsing and lunching, they will only come up here for a specific purpose, which is not the kind of business that Clifton relies upon.</p> <p>People will no longer want to park in Clifton and spend the day in town as their time will be limited.</p> <p>Locals will battle to park and as a motorbike rider there won't be anywhere to pull up and park.</p> <p>There will be less green space with people prevented from easy access to the Downs for an afternoon.</p> <p>Free parking limited to the evening will only encourage the yobbish night culture that already pollutes the village at night.</p> <p>If people are protesting against decisions being made, take a step back and think that perhaps it might be for a good reason. It seems daft to turn the richest part of town against you, when the only reason that the Council are imposing parking restrictions is for monetary gain.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.2.6</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1</p>
434		<p>To have parking restricted to one hour and from 9 until 9 is crazy. The Council would get people's full cooperation if the restrictions are for three hour parking from 9 till 5 like the rest of Clifton.</p> <p>As a trader with a coffee shop which has a large footfall we will close in no time as 1 hour is not even enough time to grab a coffee and have a chat let alone do some shopping.</p> <p>Concerned that we have supposedly been part of the consultation but have not received any communication which the Council keep telling me that the whole scheme is based on. This is</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>2.1.3</p>

		unacceptable.	
435		<p>I am a consultant clinical working at the . I am required to travel there by car and carry my testing equipment with me (it fills a small suitcase).</p> <p>Most of my patients have cognitive disorders (e.g. brain injury, dementia, epilepsy) and will have difficulty travelling by public transport. Most of them arrive by car with a carer or friend.</p> <p>The nature of my work requires four hour long appointments and sometimes longer. It would not be practical for me or my patients to have to stop in the middle of an assessment to move cars.</p> <p>If it is impractical for both me and my patients to park there for the duration of the appointment, then I will be forced to look for other premises for my practise.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>432</p>
436		<p>Objects to the revised RPS proposal implementing a pay and display only area on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. If introduced the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents and businesses of Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings by reducing the number of parking spaces available by half.</p> <p>Also concerned that BCC has not afforded residents a reasonable opportunity to respond to these significantly revised proposals. BCC has not written to residents inviting any comment (e.g. by postcard as it did previously), and has permitted only a limited three week period within which to respond.</p>	5.8
437		<p>Clifton is too far away from the city to attract commuter traffic.</p> <p>The moment parking meters are installed it becomes a place where people feel under pressure, where the very soul that makes Clifton so unique is taken away.</p> <p>The 150 employees of Sterling Engineering are talking of relocating already – imagine what those people contribute to the businesses of the Village.</p> <p>Apart from anything else parking meters are ugly and modern, spoiling what is such a unique area of beautiful architecture. There are planning restrictions and yet meters are ok?</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.5</p>
438		<p>The proposals for Royal York Crescent still include double yellow lines along the whole length of the North side of the road in front of the garages. This will remove a large number of existing parking spaces that are currently used by garage owners and will have significant impact.</p> <p>Given the natural restrictions in road width that already exist at the end and middle of the Crescent, as well as the restrictions created by the proposed disabled spaces, I cannot see what the benefit is to be gained by not allowing garage owners to park on the north side of the road. This will not restrict emergency vehicles any more than the permanent features along the road.</p> <p>An added concern is that stopping parking on this side of the road will have the effect of widening it,</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p>

		<p>which will inevitably result in an increase in traffic speed along the Crescent, which will have a negative impact on both safety and noise.</p> <p>The lack of evidence that has been presented by the Council regarding existing parking habits. It is stated that the main purpose of the scheme is to reduce pollution in Bristol by discouraging commuter parking. No evidence has been presented that this is actually an issue in Clifton Village.</p> <p>The biggest problem is in the middle of the night when all of the residents of the area are at home. There are already more residents' cars than there are spaces. So how can you reassure me that with the significant reduction in available spaces that the Council propose, that I will not be driving around all night trying to find somewhere to park my car.</p> <p>The problem is made worse for me as I live on the edge of a zone, with Cliftonwood RPS. If I am unable to find parking in my street I will have very few viable alternatives.</p> <p>Surely it would be fairly straightforward to have undertaken surveys of existing parking habits at various times of day and night to estimate the numbers of spaces needed by the permanent residents; to see how many commuters are using the area; to assess the numbers of students with cars; and to demonstrate that the proposals are sound. Using registration numbers you must surely be able to identify where vehicles are registered, making the exercise simple and very effective.</p> <p>The lack of data suggests that the Council has either: Done this work and not published because the results are not what was wanted. Not done the work because they think the answers will not be what is wanted. Not considered that the concerns of the residents are at all valid. Not even considered doing such work so that facts not guesswork can be used to develop appropriate solutions.</p> <p>Why has this information not been obtained and presented to residents, other than as a result of the Council being either unscrupulous or incompetent.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>6</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>
439		<p>I wish to register my wholehearted support for the proposed residents' parking scheme for Clifton.</p> <p>The current situation is not sustainable; it is ludicrous that an area of such importance to the city as a whole should be chronically congested with parked vehicles.</p> <p>It is inequitable that local residents are denied all the benefits of RPS enjoyed by their fellow citizens elsewhere.</p> <p>Business will thrive as customers have several options of parking for short or longer periods for very little cost. Bath is an excellent example of this working in practise.</p>	Comments noted

		<p>Most people expect to pay for parking when they visit an area as a tourist, being unable to find a parking place is more likely to be a deterrent than having to pay £1 per hour.</p> <p>There is a lot of support for this proposed scheme, please don't be deterred by a vocal minority who may perhaps work in Clifton but are not residents.</p>	
440		The parking restrictions that are being proposed will change the village and surrounding areas for the worst.	1.4
441		<p>The scheme would double my commuting time, necessitating me to leave home an hour earlier and return an hour later to use public transport.</p> <p>The cost of using public transport/Park and Ride would significantly add to my present travelling costs.</p> <p>I work to an appointment system and could not rely on public transport to get me to work with only nine minutes to spare.</p> <p>Being unable to park locally may force me to seek employment elsewhere. Additionally, clients being unable to park nearby may result in them taking their custom elsewhere, where parking is less restricted.</p> <p>Businesses like others locally, may be forced to close without the lifeblood of customers.</p>	<p>4.51</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.5.1</p> <p>4.4 &amp; 4.1.3</p> <p>1.3</p>
442		<p>Might I suggest that we do here what is done in most towns in France and that is to have no charges between 12:30 and 14:30 to enable people to go to lunch. Similarly there should be more leeway for people who want to eat out at night.</p> <p>There should be more spaces with 2/3 hour parking available, because it is a little idiotic to have to rush out of the hairdressers covered in curlers or tin-foil to feed a meter (isn't that illegal anyway).</p> <p>I feel that the protestors will not find their trade decreasing if more people can park for shorter periods throughout the day.</p>	<p>3.4.4</p> <p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.2.2</p>
443		<p>I work as a carer visiting 8 households in a day covering all the parking schemes so this will make life difficult if my employer does not purchase or is not entitled to purchase permits for us.</p> <p>There is a problem with commuter parking but that would be easily solved by having the RPS times for 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours late afternoon/evening.</p> <p>On a personal note, once a month I go to the hairdressers in Southville and am usually there for 2 and a half hours, then go up North Street to shop but I won't be able to anymore.</p>	<p>3.7</p> <p>3.4.4</p> <p>4.1.1</p>
444		The current system actually works. Residents go to work and the local workforce park in the spaces	1.2.2

	that they leave and in the evening, vice versa. This is the same across the City and across the land.	
	A lot of my employees live in the areas of Bristol which means that they need to take two buses to work. The cost is very high for them but more importantly the buses do not run at the critical times in order to get them to work.	4.5
	Not everyone can drive so the few drivers who are fortunate to own a vehicle are the backbone of our workforce. They will now be asked to contribute to their parking which is something that they have not had to do before. This is too much for them – they are already struggling to make ends meet.	3.2.1
	The transport infrastructure within Bristol is not sufficient to support workers travelling across the City and until it is vastly improved the Council needs to rethink the introduction of RPS across all areas of the City.	4.5
	You must realise that getting two buses to work is problematic and adds a lot more time onto journeys.	4.5
	I am 50 years old and I am now wrestling with riding a motorbike for the first time in my life but nonetheless is the most time efficient way of travelling to work (my commute would take 2 hours daily by bus). This is what needs to be improved upon. Hopefully, I will not have an accident but statistics state otherwise.	4.5 4.6
	The Council are pushing people outside of their comfort zones and for some of my employees; it will mean them having to give up their job. Some are already leaving now and it will be mighty hard to replace them.	4.6
445	Whilst I have to leave my car at home on the road, that is one less space for someone else to park in for their work or for dropping off their child safely at school.	3.3.1
	There will not be enough visitors parking places to support the restaurants and shops in Clifton.	4.1
	Many people require at least 2 hours to shop and/or eat.	4.2.2
	There is not enough visitors parking as it is and further restrictions will damage the businesses in Clifton as well as destroying the quality of life to those of us who frequent the Village and spend money there.	4.1.1
	No long term car parks available within reasonable walking distance.	3.3
	Public transport to Clifton is inadequate and expensive.	4.5
	Cycling is not available to those of us who are no longer young.	4.5



		By all means limit parking all day for those who use the area as a car park for working in the City Centre but if so, ensure that adequate parking is available for them also.	1
		Tried to object on the RPS website but have been totally unable to find where to do so.	Noted
446		Objects to the scheme and is appalled the plans are already being put in place despite the consultation period still being open.	2 5.4
		Aware of the change in atmosphere. The village has always been a joyous and harmonious place. Relies on groups for new mums for social life. They will no longer be able to meet in the village.	1.4
		Local businesses are going to be affected negatively.	1.3
		Thinks the council should listen to the public opinion.	2
447		Having lived here for many years we have watched the influx of commuter cars increase year after year, the parking situation is now quite insupportable for everyone.	1.4
		The traders have banded together to make as much noise as possible. It should be pointed out that some of the traders are also commuters, parking for free. Many, who work in this Clifton area, including several schools, are also commuters – they are not residents.	Comments noted
		As to visitors to the Village, where else would they go to get our special atmosphere? - there is nowhere else like Clifton and these visitors will continue to come – this protest is because no one likes to have to pay to park if they can get it for free by shouting loudly.	
		Clifton Park Road is one of the first roads to be used when the village is oversubscribed. Even with the new RPS it will continue to be used by visitors but it is our fervent hope that the situation will improve. Certainly doing nothing is not the answer.	
448		The whole process has been fast tracked and the initial consultation stage did not happen. The scheme is based on insufficient research.	2
		The current plans are not workable and significant change is required before they are deliverable.	1.4
		The one hour parking will directly result in loss of trade. Already heard customers saying they will not come to the village if the scheme goes ahead. The scheme will have a detrimental effect on the economic viability of the area.	4.2.2
		Finishing at 9pm further inhibits people wanting to come to the village.	3.4.1
		Insufficient public transport links will affect the ability to retain good staff.	4.5.1

		The small number of permits offered to businesses will make it difficult to carry out day to day operations.	4.3
449		<p>I work as a . I and colleagues are required to use our cars for work as we undertake field work with research participants in Bristol and the surrounding areas. We are often in and out of the office several times each day, carrying heavy equipment to and fro from these visits. Many of us also have caring responsibilities and are already juggling our working hours with school runs before and after school. The parking zones will make our work very difficult (and expensive/impossible if we are to have to spend our research grant on parking each day).</p> <p>The Bristol public transport links are not currently good enough to provide a viable alternative to driving to work.</p> <p>There are no direct buses from this area to Clifton, and the Parson Street trains are infrequent, with poor connections to Clifton. Without off street parking in Clifton, I would need to spend 2 hours walking to/from work each day. This taking valuable time away from my family.</p> <p>I feel that the people who live in and work in Clifton have not been properly consulted on this issue and ask that these zones are not implemented.</p>	<p>4.3.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2</p>
450		The Clifton parking scheme is unwanted, unwarranted, unreasonable, and undemocratic and will only add to any present parking difficulties and adding silly, excessive costs.	<p>1.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>1.4</p>
451		<p>The proposed RPS in Clifton East is going to create huge problems for the many people who live outside of Bristol at locations poorly served by public transport e.g. Chew Valley or who have asymmetric commuting arrangements.</p> <p>Unfortunately, my two children live outside Bristol in a village with poor bus connections. In order to see them during the week and participate in their school lives I often need to take a car to work.</p> <p>At the moment, the free for all parking around Clifton seems to work. There is a natural restriction on parking due to the limited availability of spaces during the daytime, but residents leave, workers arrive, and everyone seems happy.</p> <p>Why abandon a system which seems to work (mostly), and impose another financial burden on everyone (workers and residents) whilst also threatening to drive away shoppers and visitors.</p> <p>There are no alternatives, i.e. cheap all-day car parks, if driving is (due to personal circumstances) a necessity.</p>	<p>4.3.1</p> <p>4.3.1</p> <p>1.2.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.6</p>

452		<p>I object to the parking restrictions you are bringing in. The hours I think are 9 to 5pm because the 'residents are complaining about parking' are the majority not at work at those hours?</p> <p>Or is it another excuse for asking more money from us hard taxed workers?</p> <p>It's too far to cycle and unsafe on the roads.</p> <p>Has to start work early in the morning and would have to catch two buses which are not regular, and will be late for work.</p> <p>The fares are too expensive.</p> <p>It is too far to walk and early in the morning and to walk back home after a hard day of work.</p> <p>I pay my road tax, so I can park anywhere so long it's not on yellow lines and obstructing emergency areas.</p>	<p>3.4.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.5,5.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.1</p>
453		<p>It is not ideal but the current system for parking works, it is free to use and residents are satisfied with it and accept it. However, it baffles me why the Council should repeatedly exacerbate the limited availability of parking spaces close to where I live for no apparent reason.</p> <p>Paving over spaces at each end of Lansdown Place</p> <p>Replacing spaces with a bus parking zone (outside Christchurch School, where I have only once ever seen a bus).</p> <p>Permitting the development of a block of flats Kensington Place with an insufficient number of parking spaces for the number of residents. Also, permitting the widening of the parking free zone at the exit onto the street.</p> <p>Permitting a private car hire company, City Car Club to commandeer parking spaces for their exclusive use.</p> <p>The parking scheme will cause my patients difficulty finding somewhere to park when they attend, and anxiety about possibly receiving a fine when appointments overrun. Many are elderly, with limited mobility and the current arrangements for free on street parking works fine.</p> <p>Your authoritarian drive to impose a charge to park where we live shows no regard for residents or their howls of protest.</p> <p>People in every income bracket are being pumped for money at every turn and by everyone they</p>	<p>1.2.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1.3 1.4</p> <p>1.2.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p>

		deal with. What sort of Mayor believes he can just keep on raising local tax and revenue from whatever disposable income is available to people who are exposed to rising costs with no commensurate rise of income? I sincerely hope that (the scheme) is rapidly exposed for the cynical cash raising exercise it is and thrown out.	
454		<p>Objects to the scheme.</p> <p>Asks why do a consultation if we are going to impose restrictions anyway. The council is meant to listen to the people and be their advocates. No listening and bulldozing ahead anyway breeds apathy but that is probably what the council wants.</p> <p>Asks why the Clifton scheme is more expensive for permits than other areas of the city.</p> <p>Asks if they will be penalised for living on West Mall where the restrictions run until 9pm? Will they have to pay for extra guest parking?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.4.1</p>
455		<p>The scheme would leave me unable to let my family come to stay. The only way they can come to stay is if they are able to bring their families in a car to see me and stay overnight. All other forms of transport would be impractical and expensive.</p> <p>The proposed parking scheme would mean I would need to register each one and I just cannot afford to do this.</p> <p>I am unable to get to work on some days without the use of a vehicle because the bus services do not cover every journey I need to make and they often prove unreliable.</p> <p>I am concerned that Clifton Village trade and tourism would be badly affected by the proposed moves and I feel that the scheme would effectively kill off Clifton as a centre of tourism and trade.</p> <p>The parking schemes have been voted on before by the Clifton Village residents and traders and turned down, each time we are met with another attempt to put the scheme in again.</p>	<p>3.6</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>1.1</p>
456		<p>The proposal will ruin the 'jewel in the crown' of Bristol, Clifton.</p> <p>Agrees parking needs be handled but not in such a devastating and restrictive way.</p> <p>Know many people whose businesses rely on clients coming to them. Making them pay will put them off and visitors' permits do not guarantee a space.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
457		You are meant to represent the views of your electorate but in this instance you are woefully out of touch. There is a palpable war atmosphere in Clifton as we are all united in our objection to your ludicrous proposed parking scheme.	1

		<p>You will stifle business by stopping people visiting the village.</p> <p>Residents will have to pay yet another tax for fewer parking spaces in their road.</p> <p>No employer is realistically going to pay for a parking permit for their employees, if their employees, if their business manages to survive the financial strangle hold caused by the scheme.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>1.2.1</p> <p>4.6</p>
458		<p>Lives in Felton and has a very limited bus service, it is expensive and does not run regularly enough, resulting in her working hours being extended. The bus service is also being threatened with being withdrawn.</p> <p>The Long Ashton Park and Ride is poorly located. What is the logic in sending commuters into town to get back out again, causing more chaos and increasing emissions. For this to work the Park and Ride needs to be situated away from traffic not at the centre of it.</p> <p>Many people including myself will have to leave our present employment due to travelling time and costs involved. I cannot afford to spend that amount of money on transport to work, it simply is not worth it and know this will affect many other people.</p> <p>How about people who have taken part time jobs because they can drop their children at school and drive to work, returning in time to collect them. With parking restrictions this is not going to happen, by the time they get here they would only be able to stay a couple of hours before they have to battle with public transport to get back to collect them.</p> <p>What about peoples leisure time – are we not entitled to any? For example, currently I frequently go to the gym to keep myself fit. This is not going to happen by the time I get home I will be exhausted.</p> <p>I think the whole idea is totally outrageous with public transport being how it is and should be abandoned until public transport is massively improved.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.3.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.5</p>
459		<p>I oppose the planned permit parking scheme for the Village. It will force small businesses into administration and have negative effect on the feel of the village.</p>	<p>1.3</p>
460		<p>Believe the scheme is not workable in its current state and believes the plans are flawed.</p> <p>5 hours pay &amp; display is not long enough.</p> <p>The park and ride service is so slow, there are not enough buses.</p> <p>Two members of staff have said they will have to leave. They are part time working mums and the extra cost and time will not make it viable for them to come to work.</p>	<p>1.4</p> <p>4.2.7</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.6</p>

		Trade will suffer with the one hour pay & display.	4.2.2
461		Feels like they don't get anything for their council tax. Asks why they will have to pay more money to park on the roads even though they have paid council tax and road tax.	3.1.1
462		As we are an office employing 52 people within 5000 sq ft, it is clearly not logical that we qualified for the same amount of permits as an office occupied with 200 sq ft.	4.3
		The parking capacity test gives no comfort that the business will get more than 7 permits.	4.3
		To date our staff who have needed to park have been able to find a space within no more than 10 minutes of our offices – to the north of the village. This will now be a separate zone and thus not available to us now. Surely it would be better for us to park in the relatively less busy north RPS.	4.3
		The business will have to move in order to mitigate the risk of staff loss.	4.3 4.6
		There is no park and ride provision for those coming to Clifton from north of the city.	4.5.3
		The proposed scheme is fundamentally flawed because there will be less parking options for staff and customers at all businesses. There are not suitable public transport options.	4.6
		Believes that consultation has been inadequate and the initial stage of consultation did not occur. Informal consultation took place but was cut short by a week.	2
463		We need proper parking, what about a car park instead of yet another supermarket.	6
		The charges are too high in the proposed plans and just another tax.	3.1.1
		We need real proposals for an alternative to the car.	4.6
464		Quite simply the overall lack of consideration and affect the RPS will have on the area of Clifton will be potentially fatal.	1.4
		The entire scheme has been pushed through even though the majority of Councillors voted against George.	1
		There is no infrastructure to allow business employees to park, let alone visitors enough time to visit.	4.3 4.2.2
		Businesses are now leaving Clifton and relocating out of Bristol.	4.1.3 6
465		Feels the parking scheme is not fit for purpose and will bring businesses nothing but lower footfall.	1

	<p>Sees the benefits that the other schemes have brought but they are in residential areas, the village is not.</p> <p>One hour parking is just not enough and people will not want to walk a mile from the zoo to use they longer stay parking just to go to a bathroom showroom or a coffee shop.</p> <p>Will have to shut his shop and relocate somewhere else where his customers can easily get to.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.1.2</p>
466	<p>There is no evidence based data to support the proposed plans resulting in plans which are flawed. The proposals are not fir for purpose and require fundamental change.</p> <p>Bristol City Council has not completed adequate research advance. There has not been appropriate research of traffic flows in and around the village, no empirical studies.</p> <p>The number of potential spaces available for residents and businesses is unknown to Bristol City Council, they have no evidenced based data from the Village to support their assumptions.</p> <p>Parking limit of 1 hour is restrictive to trade and 100% of retailers questioned are against this.</p> <p>Business permit numbers too small and businesses are not able to carry out their work effectively due to the derisory number of permits available to them e.g. estate agents.</p> <p>Staff issues will occur due to the difficulty in getting to work with a lack of viable alternative transport options.</p> <p>Inadequate transport links to the village for visitors and employees, 2 bus links are the only alternative transport available – this is derisory.</p> <p>One link to a car park in the South of the city is wholly insufficient. There is no car park in Clifton Village and no dedicated link to a car park.</p> <p>Lack of understanding regarding the fragile business support structure, large employees on the periphery of the village provide a daily trade for retailers, restaurants, which is essential to our sustainability.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.1.4 4.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.5.2</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
467	<p>Comprehensive introduction will result in severe problems for professionals, traders, schools, local churches, visitors and will comprise extra taxes for residents who already pay some of the highest in Bristol.</p> <p>We live close to the Zoo in Cecil Road and our property has a long wall with no properties opposite. The road outside thus provides significant parking spaces for Zoo visitors and any other persons. We have no objections to people parking for free.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>Noted</p>

		The recently introduced 20 mph speed limit in this area needs reinforcing with flashing lights rather than speed cameras or other means of raising taxes.	5.1
468		<p>I realise there is a coordinated and on-going 'no' campaign, but I believe this reflects a noisy minority rather than the view of most residents.</p> <p>Possible objections on the length of waiting time for visitors/customers seem to have been completely addressed, and as a local resident, I find the amount of traffic in and around Clifton Village is far too great: causing air and noise pollution and making it unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	Comments noted
469		<p>There will be no available parking within an appropriate distance of our practise, and that our very elderly patients are going to be unable to attend their consultations.</p> <p>Can we put in a late appeal to have a reasonable number of pay and display parking spaces available adjacent to Clifton Park Consulting Rooms.</p> <p>Our patients are going to be charged for parking when previously it was free.</p> <p>Additional administration input will be required to manage our customer permits which will have to be collected from the patients after each use. This will generate extra expense. Patients may accidentally leave with the permits and more time and money will have to be spent trying to retrieve them.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>6</p> <p>1.3 4.3.1</p> <p>1.3</p>
470		<p>I do not agree with the present proposals for the above and believe that you have not considered the requirements of the traders/residents.</p> <p>I also request that you send me the following, The cost to set up the scheme.</p> <p>The cost basis for the amount of revenue taken from residents for permits.</p> <p>The cost basis for the amount of revenue taken from traders.</p> <p>The cost basis for the amount of revenue taken from penalties.</p> <p>Please provide the overall justification for the permit costs across the City and answer why they are more expensive than existing schemes.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>5.10</p> <p>3 – 3.2.2</p>
471		I cannot understand why the parking restrictions for this area BS8 3DH differ from other parts of Clifton. It seems there will be restrictions from 9am to 9pm Monday to Saturday. This is very unfair to the residents of this area.	3.4.1
472		White vans and local businesses are the problem during the day. This will not be solved by parking permits as residents will use their visitors passes for tradesmen and residents pushed out of spaces	6.1



		<p>in surrounding areas by pay and display will use Canynge Square.</p> <p>The problem is in the evening, there are not enough spaces for the number of properties due to multiple occupancy properties, the permit scheme will not change this.</p> <p>People in Canynge Square have paid a premium to live in a classic, traditional square, with listed buildings and a conservation area. The scheme with yellow lines, marked bays, payment machines and signage will help to ruin the look of the area.</p> <p>Given that the scheme will not solve anything for residents, why should we pay for something which is currently free (what exactly are we paying for)?</p> <p>There is a high turnover of visitors who only stay for 20 mins just to pick up a few bits of shopping or prescriptions. For these people parking should be free without having to get a ticket (which just leads to them parking for more time whilst they get their ticket.</p> <p>Transport links need to be joined up with good links north, south and east to bus routes and train stations. People will not park in Long Ashton and then sit on a bus in rush hour traffic. This plan will just add to poor traffic flows and increased journey times.</p> <p>Not everyone is young, fit and healthy and whilst not disabled they should have an opportunity to park near where they want to go without having to pay too much.</p> <p>No provision for dropping children at schools. Instead of reducing the number of parking spaces and virtually encouraging parents to park illegally, proper safe, drop and go provision should be made as in other towns and cities.</p> <p>Working parents do not have time to park, pay for a ticket, walk for 15 minutes and then back again.</p> <p>Some areas of the city are crying out for this type of scheme, which is fine. But for Clifton other solutions to traffic and parking issues should be sought and implemented before this type of blanket heavy handed RPS approach.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.2.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>5.1</p>
473		<p>I am deeply concerned these plans will have a negative effect on my business and I feel strongly that anyone visiting the village will almost certainly require more than 1 hour to enjoy all Clifton has to offer.</p> <p>It was my understanding that the initial hour parking would be free (as it currently is) but that visitors/customers would have the option to pay for parking up to 3 hours. Some ignore the 1 hour parking limit and do make it round the shops, but they're often hurried and feel anxious they may receive a ticket.</p>	<p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <p>4.2.2</p>

		<p>If the plans go ahead as they are currently outlined and my business suffers a drop in sales then I may be forced to hand in my notice 12 months from now and vacate my shop.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the 9am to 9pm restriction. This scheme should only run until, at the very latest, 6pm.</p> <p>I do not intend to by a permit for my business as it is too expensive. However about once a fortnight I need to unload stock and to have to pay to be able to do this in the evenings is just insulting.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
474		<p>Supports the scheme in principle and practise as has benefited in the Kingsdown area. However Kingsdown is not a shopping area so the Clifton arrangements must be different if the village shopping and café trade is to be preserved.</p> <p>Introduce resident parking permits and allow free parking for all up to but no longer than 2 hours – only permit holders allowed to park for more than 2 hours. Thus commuters are excluded, residents parking is enabled, shoppers have to time to visit and no need for expensive and ugly parking ticket machines.</p>	<p>4.1.3 6</p> <p>3.4.4</p>
475		<p>Commuters and shoppers banned from parking in the City Centre will, as in other cities, find the next nearest available spaces, which is likely to be Leigh Woods or the Downs or parts of the City not included in RPS.</p> <p>Will the Council be prepared to build more out of town park and ride spaces in our fabulous countryside?</p> <p>We are still in a fragile position only just emerging from recession, why risk rising unemployment because of businesses relocating elsewhere, shops closing through lack of trade and the parking problem not solved just moved.</p>	<p>4.1.3</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3</p>
476		<p>The Bristol Photographic Society are surprised and very disappointed that Bristol City Council has concluded that extending the parking scheme to 9pm will not harm the local Clifton leisure economy.</p> <p>40% of membership travel up to 30 miles to attend meetings often more than once a week. These people regularly use Clifton businesses for shopping and dining. Having to pay for parking would be a significant extra burden for our members and many would leave.</p> <p>The society operates the largest international photographic Salon in the UK. The running of this Salon requires many members and visiting judges to attend for long periods of time throughout March. It is unlikely that we will be able to continue with any parking scheme that is limited to a few hours with no return.</p> <p>We are already looking for alternative premises, possibly outside of Bristol given the City Council's</p>	<p>3.4.1</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.1 4.1.3 4.2.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p>

		plans to further extend parking schemes. It would be a shame for our members and a financial loss to Bristol businesses if we are forced to move.	
477		<p>I park for business and whilst I have no objection to paying to park; the maximum 1 hour proposed is overly restrictive and doesn't allow a reasonable amount of time to either shop or use the local restaurants.</p> <p>I also think that 9am-9pm is overly long and that something closer to 10am-4pm would be a more reasonable compromise.</p>	<p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.1.1</p>
478		<p>I park on Clifton streets as the parking provided by the University is extremely limited.</p> <p>I drive into Bristol because the public transport is extremely unreliable and exorbitantly expensive.</p>	<p>4.3.1</p> <p>4.5</p>
479		<p>I think there is a more specific issue which should be focused on finding out who is contributing to the traffic and contesting streets with parked cars vs who is a visitor and helping generate the micro economy of the area.</p> <p>Better bus connections from other points in town like Bedminster to Clifton would be ideal without wiping out the cycle paths.</p> <p>I do not agree that residents and business owners should pay for parking in their own area.</p> <p>The state of Princess Victoria Street is dire: hazardous to cyclists and pedestrians. A lot of this is due to allowing large articulated lorries for deliveries on a narrow street. Supermarket chains should be minimised in the village and large lorries like that should not be allowed in the narrow streets.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>Noted</p>
480		<p>The scheme does not guarantee to improve matters – it will not remove cars from the roads of Clifton. It will not guarantee me a parking space, so what exactly am I paying for?</p> <p>Is the cost largely to pay for the parking wardens to police the scheme?</p> <p>If the scheme goes ahead, how long will it be before the fees go up?</p> <p>One of the objectives is to improve air quality in Bristol generally. This can only be achieved through a combination of reducing the number of vehicles and emissions from business – almost impossible to measure in order to attribute to any single initiative.</p> <p>It must be enormously concerning to see the strength of opposition to the RPS especially in Clifton – so at what point does the process be anti-democratic. If the vast majority of the residents do not want the scheme, why proceed with it? If it were put to a vote, there would be a massive negative result.</p>	<p>1.2</p> <p>3</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>1</p>

		Why do new supermarket applications get the go ahead. When there is limited parking, difficult access for loading and no need for another supermarket.	1
		If the consultation process turns out to be a sham and the parking plans go through despite opposition, will there be a chance to review and reverse things in the future.	2.2.3
481		You have unilaterally to impose additional charges on residents, essentially a tax, to use the road space outside my home.	1
		The current informal arrangement whereby people can relatively easily a space close to their destination, whether as resident or visitor appears to work pretty well.	1.2.1
		I can see no justification other than raising cash for the proposals.	1.2, 1.3 1.4
		I can only think of one occasion when I had to park more than 20m from my front door.	3.3.1
482		Parking is not an issue. There is a natural movement in and out that works for everyone.	1.2
		Having restriction for shoppers is an issue.	4.1.1
		Having parking ticket machines in a list/conservation area is an issue.	4.1.5
483		I would like to object to the proposed residents' parking scheme on grounds of damaging local business.	1.3
		A parking scheme that I would assume I would have to pay for would stop me having use of a car.	1
		Looking at reducing the number of double yellow lines and single yellow lines to free up more parking spaces would be a better option.	3.3.1
		Or a pay as you park scheme for non-residents that would then fund the residents parking programme.	3.1.1
		The Council introduced paid parking around Bristol University and all that has resulted in is empty car spaces that aren't used.	1.2
484		I cannot see any benefit to the residents at all and even if there was, surely it should be decided in a democratic way.	1.2
		Please can you highlight which stakeholders are set to benefit from this scheme?	1
		It appears as something that is purely brought in for the sake of cash generation and ignoring both	1 & 3.1.1

		residents and business owners.	
485		<p>Thinks the plans need fundamental change and the plans are not fit for purpose. Significant changes are needed to make the scheme viable and deliverable.</p> <p>One hour parking and the introduction of meters in the village is off-putting to visitors. People will not visit for a leisurely visit if they are under a time pressure. Less time spent in the village means less money.</p> <p>Public transport is not good enough to the village.</p> <p>There is no car park to serve the village. West End car park is a 20 minute walk away.</p> <p>The cost of permits for businesses will add pressure on already difficult financial times.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>3.2.1</p>
486		<p>Putting in a scheme that we don't want on the basis that it will be accepted after the fact is plain bulldozing and insulting. It is patently obvious that we are simply not being listened to.</p> <p>Why spend my hard-earned rate payers money on so called consultation. Come clear and own the fact that you have no interest in consultation other than to do a bit of tinkering on the edges so you can say you have listened.</p> <p>As a resident I dread the hard-nosed commercialism that comes with parking meters, notices and yet more traffic wardens.</p> <p>We are now charged to park by our homes by means of a permit – I have experienced visiting family elsewhere where these schemes operate and it's a nightmare for guests.</p> <p>There is no guarantee on the price of these residents' permits beyond 3 years.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
487		I believe it is an ill-thought out scheme that penalises many of the local businesses, along with the local employers who have many employees who are required to commute into the City.	4.3.1
488		<p>Is motorcycle parking going to be subject to the same time restrictions as a car parked in the same space i.e. is a motorcycle that is parked in a pay and display space for free, limited to parking for a maximum of 5 hours, or can a motorcycle park for longer?</p> <p>In the situation where all pay and display spaces are taken, can a motorcycle park in a fully restricted area (i.e. on a double yellow line).</p>	<p>4.2.6</p> <p>3.2.3</p>
489		I would like to apply to not have double yellow lines outside my driveway.	5.4

490		<p>Not only will the scheme damage Clifton, in terms of shoppers and visitors but for residents it will make life more difficult.</p> <p>We live on Harley Place and we will have less restricted parking permit hours, this will mean that outside those hours we will be under pressure from the overflow from the area south of Harley Place.</p> <p>It would surely make more sense to include Harley Place in the more restricted parking hours to allow residents to at least have the opportunity to use their spaces.</p> <p>I am also slightly confused as to the inclusion of Harley Mews, I thought Harley Mews was owned by the residents and was not adopted by the Council.</p>	<p>1.2 1.3 1.4</p> <p>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>5.3</p>
491		<p>I object most strongly to the proposal to have restrictions on Richmond Terrace up to 9pm at night when the rest of Clifton is set for 5pm.</p> <p>Can you explain your reasons for the proposal?</p>	<p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.4</p>
492		<p>The Council claims that the majority of the people of Clifton Village want a parking scheme I simply do not believe this.</p> <p>Who was consulted? What form this consultation took? When this took place?</p> <p>I fear that the RPS would render many of the shops unviable, as a lot of staff would be unable to get here and shoppers would be deterred and for some purchases at least would patronise Cribbs or Cabot Circus.</p> <p>Payment machines and other street furniture would also be completely out of character here.</p> <p>The Council claim that the motive behind RPS is to deter commuter parking rather than to raise revenue. In that case why not give residents and businesses permits or simply levy a small charge to cover costs?</p> <p>Why should we have to pay considerable sums for permits for ourselves, visitors, staff and customers when there would still be no guarantee of a parking place?</p>	<p>1.2.2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1.3 4.1.2</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.3 3.3.1</p>
493		<p>We are writing to object strongly to the proposal to remove all double yellow lines in the Paragon and to introduce a permit parking area.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces and the area of the turning space in the Paragon have been carefully worked out. The provision we have at present cannot be improved on and should be left as it is.</p>	<p>5.6</p> <p>5.6</p>
494		<p>I work in 7 different clinics all over Bristol including North and South Bristol I need my car. How do you suppose health care professionals visit their unwell patients at their homes with this parking</p>	<p>3.7</p>

	<p>scheme?</p> <p>The cost is another issue, if I have to pay a minimum of at least £70 a year on top of my road tax just to park my car at my home and not even be guaranteed a space.</p> <p>Why are the restrictions until 9pm? how much money are you going to charge us for permits? Our friends and family won't be able to visit at all.</p> <p>I think a resident parking scheme could be a good idea, why not offer free permits to residents? Why don't you make the businesses whose staff park on our road pay?</p> <p>No one it appears is for this scheme. Now where is the democracy in that?</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>2</p>
495	<p>Many small/medium businesses (apart from Tesco, Co-op, Café Nero) will go out of business.</p> <p>This scheme is all about money.</p> <p>One hour parking is not enough.</p> <p>Has collected 30 signatures from residents, visitors, commuters and tourists who are against the scheme.</p> <p>Lack of public transport links in the village.</p> <p>Proper consultation has not happened.</p> <p>The empty streets in Cotham and Kingsdown have made the situation worse in Clifton.</p> <p>Paying for a permit will not guarantee a space near home or work.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2</p> <p>1.2.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
496	<p>Banning all parking on the north side of the crescent would mean a loss of some 40 spaces. The assumption that all the garages would then be used is based on the false assumption that they are usable for modern cars. Most of them are not.</p> <p>The garages are narrow and manoeuvring in and out would be a lengthy process, creating stress and delays at peak times. At other times in the day the current parking arrangements act as a check on speed of traffic. Without that check, the road would become a fast rat run and danger to children and elderly residents.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p>
497	<p>Should the proposed parking restrictions be introduced it will kill off small businesses.</p> <p>If such arrangements are forced within the area I live I would seriously consider leaving Bristol.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>6</p> <p>1.2</p>

		What Bristol needs is a large multi-storey car park perhaps subterranean such as Hyde Park in London has built. The Downs would be an ideal situation without spoiling the green space.	4.6.4
		We also need more efficient, reliable and affordable public transport.	4.5
498		Could you kindly allow the parking in the region to be free from 6pm as opposed to 9pm. This will really help not only my family and friend's park when they visit, but also the family and friends of my neighbours that have reached an age where they can no longer leave the immediate vicinity of their homes instead relying on visitors to offer them companionship and contact with the outside world.	3.4
499		In front of my house and drive there are is still a no stopping area, and opposite the drive entrance to the garage, cars will be allowed to park. I cannot access my drive if a car is parked opposite.	5.18
500		If the planned parking restrictions go ahead I do not think I shall be able to continue my work in Clifton and will move to offices near Cabot Circus where I can park for the necessary time.	4.3.1
501		I have a small business and 5 of us use cars; I understand that we will only be entitled to 3 permits.	4.3.1
		I have a tenant who has 6 car users but as they do not pay a business rate direct to the Council, I understand they will qualify for nil permits.	3.5
		The proposed arrangement will clearly restrict parking spaces these plans are totally unacceptable.	1.4
		More permits should be available to businesses like mine.	4.3.1
502		The scheme is bound to have a detrimental effect on all businesses, shops and restaurants in the area.	1.3
		The scheme does nothing to provide any alternative means of travelling to the area.	4.5
		What is the logic of people with a drive only being allowed one permit while people with no drive can apply for three? None of the driveways in our road can accommodate more than one car so that is grossly unfair and illogical.	3.5.1 3.5.2



		<p>It would be more sensible and cost effective to not put the double yellow lines across driveways in the first place.</p> <p>The Council seem perfectly happy to massively reduce the amount of parking available through these lines for absolutely no good reason.</p> <p>This is supposed to be a public consultation – but I am seeing no evidence whatsoever of anyone at the Council listening.</p>	<p>2.1.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>2</p>
503		The proposed scheme will make it much more difficult for me to continue my work in Bristol as spending more time trying to find somewhere to park will make my link with your city and its University an inefficient use of my time.	4.3.1
504		<p>I will live far away from work, not on a major bus route and will struggle to attend work with this new scheme.</p> <p>All that will happen is that everyone will park on the Downs, causing further congestion.</p> <p>I have an allotment off Cranbrook Road. What am I supposed to do with carrying compost, garden items etc if I am no longer allowed to park there?</p> <p>These schemes are ridiculous and transparent cash grab for permits.</p> <p>It is highly immoral that you are trying to force them through since we live in a democratic society and what we the populace want, is what should be happening.</p>	<p>4.3.1</p> <p>6</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>2</p>
505		<p>If this Resident Parkin Only goes ahead, it will kill Clifton Shops. Nobody will come into Clifton if they cannot park.</p> <p>It makes life hard for those people who work here too.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.3.1</p>
506		The changes you proposed with the Council for Clifton, in our opinion will definitely have a negative effect on your beautiful area for small businesses, residences and visiting public.	1

507		<p>Our first preference is for double yellow lines between the garages with sufficient space to allow the owner of the garage to park outside their own garage. This would then align with the guidance given and the limitation of 1 permit for those people with garages.</p> <p>Our second preference would be double yellow lines along the whole of royal york crescent or at least stretches of it where there are garages which would allow us to safely turn and park cars into the garage, If this option was implemented I would expect that we could still apply for 2 permits as only one space is available to us outside the scheme.</p> <p>No double yellow lines or permit bays adjacent to the garages is not a viable option as again we would not be able to safely use our garages as commuters would continue to use these spaces as they do now and often park poorly blocking our exit/entrance.</p> <p>We are disappointed that some local businesses, who are a noisy minority, are selfishly ignoring the wishes of the majority of residents who support the scheme. The sooner the scheme is implemented the better, especially as the implementation of the Cliftonwood/Hotwells scheme will no doubt displace more commuters into Clifton.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>Comments noted</p>
508		<p>These schemes do not produce any of the benefits that they are intended to. They produce unfairness, arbitrary parking provision and untold inconvenience to residents.</p> <p>Local businesses and the character of the area are already suffering simply in anticipation of the scheme, which has been introduced in the most arrogant and undemocratic way.</p>	<p>1.2.1</p> <p>1.3</p>
509		<p>The Pay and Display parking within the core of the village area is for an hour only. This is far too short for people to enjoy the amenities of the village and should be extended to at least 3 or 4 hours.</p> <p>We do not believe that there is adequate pay and display parking available. We do not wish to discourage people who need to park for short periods of time from visiting friends or relatives. We would therefore welcome more areas to be shared between pay and display and permit parking.</p> <p>A number of roads are proposed to have no parking on one side of the road, which will have the effect of significantly reducing available parking in the Clifton area, which seems contrary to the aims of the scheme set out.</p> <p>We draw your attention to a small area in the centre of Harley Place which is marked as parking not permitted at any time. There is no apparent reason for this marking and we are therefore flagging it as a potential amendment.</p> <p>Harley Place is a grade 2 listed terrace and that this presumably prevents the siting of a pay and</p>	<p>4.2.2</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>6</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>4.1.5</p>

		<p>display machine and parking signage in front of the terrace. We suggest that any machine and signage be sited in front of the modern flats to the left hand end of the terrace.</p> <p>We would suggest that English Heritage should be consulted in this regard for other listed terraces, houses and other buildings within the parking scheme.</p> <p>Given the very high rates of Council tax in Clifton it seems reasonable that each house should be given a single free permit.</p> <p>The restriction to a single residents permit placed upon houses on private roads or garages seems inequitable and we request that the Council change the proposal to allow such properties to hold two residents' permits: one free of charge and the other for a nominal sum.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.5.1 3.5.2 5.3</p>
510		<p>I am aware that the commuters coming into Clifton, although at times a nuisance, do make viable the local businesses that pay your rates. Making their life more difficult must in the long term must be detrimental.</p> <p>The current arrangement on Clifton Park Road is that adequate parking is provided by using the pavement on the side of the long wall. Implementing parking bays on both sides will prevent refuse trucks from coming through. If parking were only permitted on one side of the road a lot of cars would be displaced elsewhere which would only be exporting the problem. This demonstrates that the proposals do not work.</p> <p>It would be better to make it a one way road with entry from the Christ Church side.</p>	<p>4.1.1</p> <p>6</p> <p>5.1</p>
511		<p>Our offices are in Pembroke Road with about 100 people based in this building. If the proposals are introduced it is difficult to understand how our staff who come from far and wide will get to work.</p> <p>Our understanding is that we will be allowed a maximum of 7 permits in which circumstance it is difficult to understand how we can continue our business in the Clifton area.</p> <p>Our staff bring a good deal of business to Clifton traders and if others are in the same position as us the whole area could begin to decline.</p>	<p>4.3 4.6</p> <p>4.3.2, 4.3.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
512		<p>I own a garage and currently park my car outside my house in front of the garage, this is essential. It would be impossible for me to park elsewhere on the street with my children and a car full of shopping. The new restrictions will make it impossible for me to manage on a day to day basis.</p> <p>The Council are devaluing the property as you are removing one of our two current parking spaces. We will be looking to claim compensation.</p> <p>Your agenda is solely driven by money as there is not a single benefit of this scheme to any residents, businesses or workers.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1</p>

		We currently do not have a parking problem. There is a natural ebb and flow between residents leaving Clifton and workers and shoppers coming to Clifton.	1.2.2
		What would happen to people who want to come and visit us or come and stay, where are they supposed to park? There certainly will not be any room on the Crescent.	3.3.1
		I agree with the businesses in the area who are against the one hour limits as this will significantly change the visitors who come to Village.	4.2.2
513		One hour parking in the heart of the Village will not work, it is impossible to go to the hairdressers, dentist, have a lunchtime meal, got to an exercise class etc. We need a minimum of 2 hours.	4.2.2
		There is a significant reduction in visitor parking from the existing timed parking areas in the Village. We need more spaces not less.	3.3.1
		Inadequate transport to Clifton, whilst we will have the introduction of the Park and Ride from Long Ashton and the existing no 8/9 bus there is nothing to bring you from the East/south side of the City.	4.5
		I am concerned as to how my staff will get to work, how will we be able to conduct our business without the ease of parking we currently have – we need to have cars to visit clients, pick up supplies etc – the suggestion of walking or going on the bus is not an option for us.	4.6 & 4.3.1
		Concerned how I will be able to park in the evening. My road will have metered Pay and Display parking until 9pm. I will either have to pay to park close by or wait until the evening restaurant/pub trade has left and spaces become available at midnight.	3.3
		I do not relish walking around Clifton over the green at 7/8/9pm in the dark to find a parking space.	3.3
		We all accept we will have to adapt but we need better consultation and maybe a slower process for it to work.	2
		I would like to propose that the hours of RPS in Clifton run from 9-5 and there is a min 2 hour parking time for pay and display in the centre of the village.	3.4.1, 3.4.2 4.2.2
514		We have changed a few addresses within the post code BS8 and have never experienced any problem with regards to parking in this area.	1.2.2
		It all functions very well as most residents leave in the morning to travel to work while people who come to work in Clifton populate free off road spaces. Similar happens in the evening, and convinced that neither the residents nor Clifton-business/Tourist population has got any issues with the current parking arrangements.	1.2.2
515		I believe the proposal includes a restriction from Monday-Saturday 9am-9pm. This seems unnecessarily excessive. This will affect the ability for friends and family to visit, which often occurs in	3.4.1 3.4.2

	<p>the evenings/Saturdays.</p> <p>As a medical professional I often return home at variable times of the day and the only time I ever have difficulty parking in my own locality is mid-morning. Thus a Mon-Fri 9am-5pm restriction would effectively solve some of these congestion issues.</p> <p>Extending the restriction, with no extra visitor's permits is unfair.</p> <p>In addition, a scheme which prevents my friends and family visiting and using local facilities in Clifton could also damage the local economy.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.6.1 4.1.2</p>
516	<p>When I first saw the plans they allowed residents to use the parking on Gloucester Row on both sides. Now the entire north side has been designated as pay and display leaving only 50% of spaces for residents and businesses.</p> <p>I am concerned that there will not be enough space for permit holders in the street. Causing residents of Gloucester Row to be worse off than when there was no scheme in place.</p> <p>I would like the north side of the road reinstated as shared use parking.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p>
517	<p>I have to drive to work as there is no direct bus link from where I live.</p> <p>Having transport allows me to visit my disabled mother after work, she also lives in Clifton and this will have a huge impact on her as she will have to pay for visitors to park.</p> <p>If parking permits were introduced I would never consider moving to the area as my children and friends would not be able to park their cars if they wanted me to visit.</p> <p>My consultant rents rooms at Litfield House and if the permits are enforced it will be impossible for us to park our cars. Consultants and surgeons cannot leave patients to put money in meters.</p> <p>If Bristol City Council is accepting business rates, surely parking should be provided to accommodate their business clients, consultants and their staff, or there will be no business to pay rates as they will move elsewhere.</p> <p>The minimum required would be 2 permits per consultant/surgeon one for them and one for their necessary member of staff.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.3</p>
518	<p>We consider the probable effects of a pay parking scheme of, initially, £1 per hour from 9am to 9pm to be pernicious for the local economy.</p> <p>The residents will be obliged to buy so-called permits that entitle them to nothing more than they have at present.</p>	<p>3.4.1 3.4.2 4.1.1</p> <p>3.3.1</p>

519	I rent a garage for the sole purpose of parking my car outside the garage and now you are saying that I cannot park outside the garage.	5.5
	Garages in Royal York Crescent are very narrow and many people will not be able to get their cars into their garages. Well will all these people park their cars?	5.5
	Businesses will suffer terribly – having to pay for permits – plus fewer people in the village to spend money. A thriving village will become a ghost town.	1.3 & 4.1.3
520	This is nothing but an additional tax for council tax payers.	1
	RPS will not reduce congestion, people will continue to traverse the City until roads are designed and constructed for modern day use. Bristol Streets are the alternative route for driving south on the M5. Ferguson needs to with adjoining Counties for a sensible solution.	1.1
521	Works for RDF television which is on Regent Street. Bus is not regular and is very expensive. Does not earn enough to rent a space nearby. Will have to park far away and walk to work. Worries about safety of walking back to car late at night. The current system can sometimes be tricky but it is free and works for all. Better public transport is needed before a parking scheme like this can be introduced.	4.3.1 4.6
522	Has no trouble parking now and can often park outside their house. Clifton Village is a place where people pop to shop and that is under threat.	1.2.2
523	The proposals have not been thought through sufficiently to consider the effects on Bristol Zoo Gardens or designed to mitigate them.	4.2.1
	Concerned that residents' only bays will affect the availability of parking for visitors to the Zoo. The overall number of spaces will be reduced but competition for them will increase. The differential in permitted stay time across the area could place more demand upon the five hour maximum stay bays close to the Zoo. This will result in less return visits to the Zoo as people pick alternative attractions. This will particularly affect young families that travel by car with their equipment.	6
	Lack of parking for their volunteers will reduce their numbers and the viability of the Zoo's operation.	4.3
	They have no certainty of the number of permits they can apply for. Many of their staff need their cars to travel between the Zoo and their Wild Place project near Cribbs Causeway. Others live in rural areas with no public transport option.	4.3 4.6
	Bus accessibility is limited and the services are expensive. The diverted service from Long Ashton park & ride is only a minor improvement. The need to provide other alternatives has not been addressed. The introduction of the RPS is premature.	4.5
	There should be no restrictions on Saturdays at all. The proposed Saturday restriction in the south of the area will increase competition for spaces closer to the Zoo.	3.4.2

		<p>Parking restrictions should not apply during the school summer holiday as there is much less parking demand from the two schools at this time.</p> <p>The five hour maximum stay should be applied across the scheme. It would still prevent commuter parking.</p> <p>All spaces should be shared use to restrict commuter parking but allow the area to function.</p> <p>Some residents only bays are proposed on streets close to the Zoo such as College Fields. These are unnecessary as the properties have off-street parking. They should be converted to shared use.</p> <p>No allowance has been made for coach drop off near the Zoo. The proposals should retain and formalise a coach drop off in the layby on Guthrie Road.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the impact on the economy has been assessed in drawing up these plans.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>6</p> <p>1</p>
524		<p>Owns and rents out a flat on Merchants Road in Clifton Village. His mother lives on Merchants Road too and is dependent on her car.</p> <p>It is unfair to decrease the number of spaces available whilst increasing the number of dwellings, which the Council has done in recent years. Older people who have lived there for 40 years are now being penalised by this. They need to park close to their home and for visitors to be able to visit easily.</p> <p>The proposal is too complicated with varying times for restrictions and differing parking hours. This will lead to people being caught out and generate extra revenue for the Council.</p> <p>Various family members visit his mother each day to check that she is okay. The cost of this is not acceptable.</p> <p>Residents should not be limited to the number of visitors that they can have in a year.</p>	<p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.6</p>
525		<p>Appreciates that commuters need to be deterred from parking in Clifton and walking into the city centre.</p> <p>However, the proposal is disproportionate as it will reduce the numbers of visitors and tourists, which will force small businesses to close. It also requires signs and meters which will destroy the character of the area.</p> <p>A simpler system with cheaper permits preventing parking between 8 and 10am but not deterring shoppers would be much better.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>1.3 4.1.5</p> <p>3.4.4</p>

		Appalled by the restrictions to run until 9pm. A pensioner who has to care for his disabled wife, this will prevent friends and family visiting to help in the evenings. Unfair on elderly people, people with young children and the social lives of Clifton residents when restrictions in other parts of the city finish at 5pm.	3.4.2 3.6.1
526		<p>Cycles to work two days a week and uses the car on other days. His wife also has a car which is essential as they have small children. Does not have trouble parking at the moment and objects to paying for two permits.</p> <p>The scheme will not support local economic growth as stated in the Statement of Reasons unless cheap and extensive bus routes are provided. Bus routes and prices should be improved before a scheme is implemented.</p>	<p>1.2.2 3.5.2</p> <p>1.3 4.5</p>
527		<p>Objects to the pay &amp; display only bays on the north of Suspension Bridge Road. Suspension Bridge Road has almost 65 dwellings and two businesses and there are 57 parking spaces available. The proposal will restrict options for residents and businesses alike as it reduces the spaces available to permit holders by half.</p> <p>The road should be reinstated as a shared use road.</p> <p>There is not sufficient time or opportunity to comment on the revised proposals. The scheme requires more consultation due to the impact that it will have.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p> <p>2</p>
528		<p>The scheme will drive businesses away from the area into outlying business parks or other towns.</p> <p>The council seems determined to proceed no matter what the response to the consultation.</p> <p>Is not against the operating hours if a scheme has to be introduced but believes that more visitors' permits should be provided. 180, of which 120 are free, would be better.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>2</p> <p>3.6.2</p>
529		The scheme will turn Leigh Woods into a glorified car park. It will also have an impact on Clifton's future as a vibrant destination for shoppers to visit and businesses to be located in.	1.3 6
530		<p>Requests that there are no double yellow lines across his driveway and that the parking bays either side allow sufficient visibility for them to safely pull out onto the road from their drive.</p> <p>It is unfair that residents of roads where the restrictions are in force for longer receive the same number of visitors' permits as those who live in roads with shorter hours.</p> <p>Objects to the one hour free space next to the nursery. They do not need a special arrangement as the standard pay &amp; display provision provides 30 minutes free parking. There should be plenty of</p>	<p>5.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>5.16</p>



		space for parents to drop off and pick up.	
		The proposal will not protect and enhance local neighbourhood and business environments as claimed. The street clutter will be awful with the signs, lines and ticket machines required. There will still be huge demand for spaces due to the number of flats. This is what happened in Bath.	1 4.1.5
531		Many of the Georgian properties in Clifton are divided into flats so there are several cars per building. The scheme will not change this, it just imposes charges.	1
		Clifton is a vibrant destination for visitors and businesses are booming. The scheme will discourage shoppers.	1.3
		No one in the area is in favour of the scheme.	1.4
532		Lives in Hanham and drives to work in Clifton. It is very difficult and involves driving round to find a space for a long time. The only alternative is the bus, which will cost up to £8 a day and involve two buses.	4.3.1
		The scheme will cause major problems for people working in the area and for residents.	4.3 4.6
533		Was in favour of residents' parking but this proposal will destroy the community. One hour maximum stay and restrictions until 9pm are ill thought out. The present plan needs a rethink.	3.4.2 4.2.2
534		Does not own a car but will be badly affected by the limited number of visitors' permits available if the restrictions are in place six days a week for twelve hours a day. It should be re-considered.	3.6
535		Writing on behalf of the Trustees of Bristol Baptist College, The Promenade, Clifton.	Noted
		The scheme will have implications for their business and make it extremely difficult for them to continue their present pattern of working. The College provides on-site teaching and activities every week and on Saturdays for up to 60 students at a time. Students and staff move between this location and Trinity College on Bishops Close each day.	4.1.1 4.1.3
		They need easy and quick access to the college on The Promenade. There is no time for drivers to come and collect a permit from the building and it would be impossible to administrate a permit sharing system.	1.3
		Some students visit for one day a week from places including the west midlands and Devon. They spend the day traveling backwards and forwards between Baptist College and Trinity.	4.1.1
		The customer permit proposals will not work as there will not be enough of them and they are too expensive even with the discount. The time limit on parking also affects the students that study there	1.3

		all day as they will need to move their cars and could pay £10 a day.	
536		<p>Runs a small business in Clifton Arcade. The plans benefit residents but not businesses. There has been no consultation about whether the business has parking problems and the plans have not been based on proper surveys.</p> <p>Customers need to be able to park for at least two hours without paying high charges. Many are elderly or have young families and like to shop, have coffee or lunch and visit the Suspension Bridge. One hour is not enough. They should also not have to pay.</p> <p>Many shops are only just viable and will close if footfall decreases.</p> <p>There is no connection to the main park &amp; ride, the 505 is notoriously unreliable and there are no direct connections to south Bristol, Gloucester Road or east Bristol. Travelling by bus takes too long and is too expensive for families.</p> <p>There should be maximum stay parking of two or three hours with substantial free parking time and a low charge that families can afford.</p>	<p>2 1.3</p> <p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.1.2 4.1.3</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.2.2</p>
537		<p>Leaves for work before 9am and returns after 5pm Monday to Friday so the scheme will not make it easier to park outside his property. Will have to pay for a permit that will be of little value. Occasionally finishes work earlier on Fridays but the plans have no residents' only parking on Northcote Road so it will not be any easier to park.</p> <p>The operating hours should be extended to 9pm due to the number of evening events at the Zoo and Clifton College. These events make it very difficult for residents to park.</p> <p>The proposal suggests that Clifton College will have unlimited permits. They should have some but residents need to be given priority.</p> <p>Bristol Zoo's Travel Management Plan from January 2013 states that they have 180 spaces in their north car park, 160 in the west car park and 220 on the Downs for 60 days a year. They should not need any permits for employees. They should use their own spaces before parking on residential streets.</p> <p>The biggest impact on residents from the Zoo is at weekends. The scheme will not help with this. Northcote Road's restrictions should extend to Saturdays.</p> <p>Residents' parking proposals should be for the residents.</p>	<p>1.2.1</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>1.2.1</p>
538		<p>All small businesses will suffer if it goes ahead.</p> <p>Their road should not be restricted from 9am to 9pm or if it is, there should be extra visitor parking.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>3.4.2</p>

		The plans are flawed.	3.6
539		Supports the parking scheme but objects to the 9am to 9pm hours. 9am to 5 or 6pm would be fine. 9-9 could always be tried at a later date.	3.4.2
540		Works in Rodney House. Already finds it difficult to park in Clifton during the working day as they only have one off-street space. 8 of their 9 staff park on-street. The company will not pay for parking permits and they may have to move out of Clifton.	4.1.3
		She will have to park further away and walk to Clifton. This will not feel safe when it is dark. There should be more street lighting to make it safer for lone women, a Park & Ride service and better pavement surfaces as their current condition causes accidents when it is dark.	4.3.1
		Not feasible for her to walk or catch the bus as she has to drop her young daughter off before work and collect her afterwards.	4.3.1
541		Objects to the parking scheme as enjoys being able to use the spaces outside for free for themselves and their visitors. The current system is extremely flexible. Will have to now organise permits.	1.4
		Pay & display machines are ugly and will ruin the picturesque beauty of the area.	4.1.5
		The police should just pay more attention to bad parking rather than introducing this scheme.	1
		Already pays high council tax and this is just another revenue stream for the council.	3.1.1
542		His customers need to be able to park for at least two hours. The proposals will make this difficult and expensive. Customers will choose to go somewhere with free parking instead.	4.2.2
		Public transport connections are poor and unreliable. The 505 is very unreliable with a low frequency and no evening service. There are no bus connections to south, east or north Bristol.	4.5
		There has been no research on the effect on local business or on current parking patterns. Public consultation has not been done seriously or thoroughly.	2
		Many small businesses are only just viable and will disappear if footfall decreases. There needs to be longer stay on-street parking with a substantial free period followed by a low charge that families and those on low incomes can afford.	1.3 4.2.2
		There is a parking issue but this is not the best solution. Alternatives such as a congestion charge have not been properly considered.	1.1

543	<p>Residents' parking schemes affect her work as they have to park far from a patients' home and walk there. Giving permits to the patient is not a good idea. Last summer she had her car towed whilst in a patient's house trying to obtain a permit for 14 minutes.</p> <p>Will now have to pay to park outside her own house. Lives in a shared house of 5 people. They have 4 cars. Queries whether they will be eligible for permits.</p> <p>They have no information about how this will work.</p>	<p>3.7</p> <p>3.5</p>
544	<p>Lives in the city centre and cannot get a permit as there is a waiting list. Parks in areas without restrictions instead. Some of these places now have residents' parking and if this scheme is introduced her options will be even more limited. Needs to park late at night when public transport is limited and it is unsafe to walk from Clifton to the city centre. Needs to have a car to travel weekends for work and other commitments.</p> <p>The scheme is unnecessary and aimed at raising revenue.</p> <p>It will also have an impact on local businesses.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1.3</p>
545	Broadly supports the scheme. Clifton was designed to be walked around – at the moment it is littered with cars.	Comments noted
546	Identical to objection 540.	
547	<p>Did not receive a postcard about the scheme in September and neither did her neighbours so did not have an opportunity to comment on the original plans.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay is too short and will damage local businesses. A two or three hour maximum would be better.</p> <p>The long operating hours will damage restaurants and pubs. It should end at 6pm or 7pm.</p> <p>It will not make it easier for local residents, businesses and their visitors to park nearby as claimed. Some areas are pay &amp; display only, which reduces the space available for parking. The pay &amp; display bays on Sion Hill, around The mall and on Princess Victoria Street should be changed to shared use.</p> <p>The bays should be marked in a way that encourages better use of the space.</p> <p>Permit costs are excessive. They should not be more expensive than in Cotham and Kingsdown.</p> <p>More effort needs to be made to improve alternatives. Does not feel safe enough cycling but there are also not enough cycle stands available. Public transport is expensive and the need to change</p>	<p>2</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>1.2.1</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <p>6</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.5</p>

		buses in the city centre increases journey times. The car is only marginally more expensive but is much faster.	
		No figures of capacity testing or permit numbers have been produced. Residential demand and business demand should be quantified before a scheme is introduced. There are no guarantees that too many permits won't be issued. Paying and then not being able to park is unacceptable.	5.10
548		Can always park in the evenings and at weekends so believes the scheme is unnecessary. It is an unfair extra tax.	1.2.2
		The scheme will be detrimental to local businesses. It represents an extra cost and will deter customers.	1.3
		Some of his employees commute by car and park in Clifton. They do not have public transport options and the company cannot provide them with permits. Local car parks are a significant walk away and expensive so staff may leave.	4.5 4.6
		The scheme is an unnecessary expense to implement as well as causing expense for residents and businesses. The pay and display machines are unnecessary and will spoil the beauty of the scheme.	3.2.1 & 4.1.5
549		Lives in Gloucestershire and needs to park around Clifton in order to work. If it goes ahead she would either have to leave her job or be driven to work by her partner. This would increase the volume of traffic and congestion as she currently lift shares. Cannot afford public transport as it would involve two trains and would take over two hours rather than 50 minutes.	3.5.1
550		They have off-street parking for one car and own two. It is unfair that they can only have one permit where houses converted into flats can have three per flat.	3.51 3.52
		The hours should not extend until 9pm. Has not been consulted about this previously. It will cause inconvenience to them and their visitors.	3.4.2 & 2
551		The scheme will destroy Clifton. The Village is a significant asset. It will lead to loss of jobs, closure of businesses, loss of economy and infringement of personal liberty.	1
552		Objects to the double yellow lines on the crescent side of Royal York Crescent. Parking is already very limited and this will restrict it further.	5.5
553		The scheme will kill the Village. The reasons why people want to live there will disappear. It should be preserved.	1
554		Businesses will suffer due to the restrictions on their employees getting to work. If they close, the character of Clifton will be affected.	1.4 4.3.1
		The swap between local residents that commute and local workers works fine and doesn't need	1.2.2

	changing.	
	A sustainable transport policy could be achieved with RPS.	4.5
555	<p>The meters and lines will be out of keeping with the Village and the draconian restrictions will cause businesses to move out. Receiving deliveries will be difficult and people will not want to live there as people will be reluctant to visit. Can only purchase limited visitor permits.</p> <p>The restriction from 9-9 Monday to Saturday is not necessary. Tourists and visitors enjoying browsing at the weekend or enjoying restaurants and pubs in the evening will not come.</p>	4.1.5 1.3 3.3.2  3.4.2
556	Were originally sympathetic to and enthusiastic about the proposals. They now oppose them due to the restrictions proposed until 9pm. This will cause problems receiving visitors. The hours should be reduced to 5.30 or the number of visitors' permits available be increased.	3.4.2
557	<p>Clifton Village is choked by commuters who exploit the free parking and use public transport to get to the city centre. They leave their cars in Clifton for the whole day and are unlikely to be of any benefit to the local economy.</p> <p>They are very supportive of local traders and believe that the removal of commuter parking will free up a great deal of space. Traders would not necessarily be aware of the affect that their business is affected by commuter parking as it puts people off coming to Clifton in the first place.</p> <p>There is a large body of quiet support for the scheme as commuters have made the current situation impossible. The scheme will benefit residents and traders and should go ahead.</p>	Comments noted
558	The scheme will kill trade and make parking worse for residents. There are not enough spaces in York gardens and Royal York Crescent as it is. Taking spaces away would make it intolerable. It is hardest to park at night when the scheme will not be in place.	1.3 5.5
559	<p>Runs clinics from Litfield house Medical centre and The Practice Rooms on Regent street. Needs to carry confidential patient files and park for up to 8 hours a day on 3-4 days a week. Asks how this will be possible and whether parking permits will be available.</p> <p>Believes the plans require significant change before they will work.</p>	4.3  Noted
560	<p>Lives in Cliftonwood and is generally in favour of the scheme.</p> <p>However, the one hour maximum stay limit will put too much pressure on the spaces with a longer maximum stay, including those in Cliftonwood &amp; Hotwells RPS. This is unfair.</p>	Comments noted  4.2.2

		The extension to 9pm will also cause problems for Cliftonwood & Hotwells. The Clifton Village scheme needs fairer times and rules.	3.4.2
561		The plans will adversely affect local businesses as well as shoppers, residents, workers in the area and visitors. It will be more difficult for people to visit and park for a reasonable amount of time. The current arrangements are not perfect but enable free movement of people which is essential for Clifton to thrive.	1
562		There should be a compromise where residents can park and non-residents use ticket machines for up to two hours at minimal cost then £5 an hour after that. This would enable shopping and deter commuting.  Asks whether this is also planned for North street.	Noted  5.1
563		Objects to restrictions being in place until 9pm when this is not the case in other parts of the scheme. It will make it difficult for friends and family visiting and is not necessary after 5pm.  Parking is not currently an issue as there is always somewhere to park within a two minute walk. The proposals are not needed and will destroy local businesses as people will not visit due to lack of parking.	3.4.2  1.2.2 1.3
564		Objects to the scheme because it has not been thought through and does not take into account the impact it will have on businesses.  Concerned that extra buses and trains will be needed and more parking will be needed near bus and train stations and this has not been accounted for. The cars are just going to move to other areas causing a problem there.  The business needs cars to operate. Need to be able to get to clients across the city and at different offices quickly.  The roads of Clifton would be left empty during the day as residents are at work.  Has to use car to do school run in the mornings. This is not possible on public transport with getting to work as well on a certain time frame. How would I get to the school if there was an emergency?	1.3  6  4.1.4 4.3  1.4  4.3.1
565		Objects against the scheme as it is fundamentally flawed and will cause irrevocable damage to the area. Accepts that the parking does need to be managed in the village but not enough research and	1 & 2

	<p>consultation has been done and it is scandalous.</p> <p>Retailers are extremely vulnerable at the moment after the recession and with the always increasing rise of internet shopping. The scheme will have a negative effect with the one hour parking as this is not enough time to browse or go Christmas shopping. Once shoppers are lost they are hard to win back.</p>	4.2.2 4.1.2
566	<p>No-one supports the scheme. It will damage Clifton's atmosphere, hurt business and destroy the thriving community. It is intended to raise money but that will be counter-balanced by the subsequent decline of the area.</p> <p>Proceeding with the scheme is punitive and undemocratic.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1.4 6</p>
567	<p>Works part-time at Bristol Zoo. It takes 25 minutes to drive there at midday and 35-40 to drive back in late afternoon. The train to Clifton Down takes 1.5 hours a day. There is no direct public transport between North Somerset and Clifton.</p> <p>Many volunteers and seasonal staff at the Zoo will find it difficult to get to work.</p> <p>Public transport links should be improved first.</p>	<p>4.6</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.5</p>
568	<p>Is dependent on commuting by car from Little stoke. He will not be able to take his son to nursery and then park near work. Has an electric bike to assist with the commute but it is inconvenient for his wife to take their son to nursery.</p> <p>Cycle routes and their condition need vastly improving. There are numerous pot holes and uneven surfaces.</p> <p>Public transport is too inefficient to get him to work. It involves two buses and takes too long.</p> <p>Issues with cycling and public transport need addressing before the scheme is brought in.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.6</p>
569	<p>Wholeheartedly support the proposed restrictions on Christchurch Road. Concerned that the voices of residents are being drowned out by the well-orchestrated campaign against it.</p>	Comment noted
570	<p>The scheme will be detrimental to the area and have little positive impact. Parks on the street every evening with little difficulty.</p> <p>The scheme is ill thought out and against the wishes of local residents and businesses.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>



571	Restrictions from 9-9 Monday to Saturday will prevent her family and friends from visiting for the weekend and for holidays. They live in other parts of the country so need to drive.	3.4.2
	One hour parking in the Village is not enough as it is not possible to visit the dentist, hairdresser etc in this time.	4.2.2
	They do not want or need parking meters, road signs, cameras and wardens. The needs of residents, shops and businesses should be supported.	1.2 1.3
572	Support the overall aims of the scheme but object to the no waiting proposals for Clifton Park Road and the operating hours.	3.4.2
	The proposed double yellow lines from the rear garage access of 8 Worcester Crescent up to the junction of Clifton park Road and Percival Road removes six valuable parking spaces. They are needed for visitors, both family/friends and health care visitors, tradespeople etc, and because some houses have no off-street parking but more than one car. This loss of space is unnecessary.	3.3 6
	In the evenings and on Saturdays the area will be flooded with cars due to the restrictions in the south part of the scheme, so these spaces will be badly needed.	6
	The 5pm end time is too early. Many residents will not have returned from work by that time and the influx of non-permit holders will have started, so residents will be unable to park when they do get home.	3.4.2
	Disagrees with the request to restrict parking to one side of the road only that has been made by a resident with a driveway.	6
573	Recently moved to Clifton. It is easy for her family to visit regularly for a couple of hours and make sure that she is okay (she is in her eighties and recovering from surgery). The proposal will reduce their visiting time and make things more difficult for her.	1.2
574	The property has three parking spaces but is divided into five flats. Their flat does not have a parking space so they park two vehicles on-street.	3.5
	They would like clarification that they can apply for a permit. They live on a private road so the scheme will have a negative impact on them as they have two cars.	5.3
575	This is being proposed to make profit but will have a detrimental effect on the utility of the area for residents and businesses. It should not be introduced.	1
576	Has planning permission for off-street parking and a dropped kerb. Requests that the parking bay proposed across their entrance be removed. Does not want double yellow lines in front of the	5.18

	<p>driveway.</p> <p>Supports the scheme in principle but has some concerns.</p> <p>If the scheme is intended to prevent commuter parking it should not need to run until 9pm. A two hour block during the working day would achieve the same result.</p> <p>The scheme is not needed on Saturdays as residents are happy for shoppers and visitors to come to Clifton.</p> <p>A one hour time limit is much too short – three hours would allow more time for people to make use of the amenities that the Village has to offer.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>4.2.2</p>
577	Her partner parked his car on The Paragon recently due to lack of parking on her street and it was vandalised. The scheme will lead to even less parking opportunities. Residents without allocated parking should be given free permits that can be used at any time.	1.4
578	<p>Accepted parking difficulties when moving into the area and has never had to park more than one street away. The scheme will make parking more difficult as there will be less parking spaces available and there are many multi-occupancy houses. Does not want to pay to park further away. This will be unsafe after dark.</p> <p>The operating hours are too extreme and will restrict the number of visitors, both to her home and the general area.</p> <p>There will be too many unsightly parking meters, lines and signs.</p> <p>This scheme should be abandoned in favour of a simpler 'curfew hour' solution with different times on different streets for non-residents.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1.4 6</p>
579	<p>The restrictions will have a serious impact on residents who are already struggling to find somewhere to park within a mile radius of their home. There are approximately 175 dwellings in the terrace, many of whose residents need cars for a variety of reasons. As the majority of the terrace is residential it is unfair to incorporate the extended hours as they were intended to support the night-time economy.</p> <p>Traders within the terrace get their customer from the local community so do not need pay &amp; display facilities with a maximum stay of three hours. They are being penalised more than some residents that live closer to the Village traders. The scheme should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>1.2.1 3.4.2</p> <p>4.1.2</p>
580	There is very little traffic movement on Royal York Crescent now due to the parked cars, which makes it easy for tourists and residents to enjoy by walking along the terrace. Parking is difficult but not impossible as garage owners can park outside their garages.	5.5

	<p>The 9-9 hours are unnecessary if the aim is to reduce commuter parking. The end time of 9pm is too late to accommodate residents having parties and inviting several guests. Visitors' permits are not feasible as visitors may need to walk up several floors to get a permit and then back again. The number of permits is limited. It suggests the intention is to make more money.</p> <p>They had asked not to have double yellow lines outside their garage. If this is not possible they will have to put their wheelie bins and bicycles on the roadside to enable them to park in their garage. The garage is not big enough to accommodate both. This would ruin the look of the area.</p>	3.4.2
581	Identical to objection 552.	5.5
582	<p>The frontage of their house appears to have two garages but neither are fit for purpose. They were not built as garages but as entrances to the houses above. They are used to store bins and bikes as they cannot be parked in. They use the frontage for parking. The proposal to restrict parking here will not work.</p> <p>They appreciate that they are fortunate to live in a vibrant Village and are happy to comply with the planning regs and maintenance expenses that result. It will be extremely difficult to repair the property if contractors were unable to park outside as they currently do.</p> <p>Believes that the views of residents and traders are being ignored.</p>	5.5 5.5 2
583	The proposals will deter commuters but will also make parking much more difficult for residents as they will lose 35 spaces in their road. Does not own a garage but at least those that do park outside them. If they cannot then it will create a much bigger problem as most of the garages are too narrow to park in.	1.2 5.5
584	<p>There are too many different restrictions for a small area. A consistent is needed with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) three hour visitor parking with meters throughout the area for anyone apart from residents. This will deter commuters.</li> <li>b) A fair allocation of permits that ignores off-street parking.</li> <li>c) All restrictions should end at 6.00pm. Variation in hours is unfair and susceptible to legal challenge as illogical.</li> </ul> <p>There must also be a review period with further consultation after six months. If the traders are correct their businesses could be ruined. If there is a significant loss of trade action must be taken.</p>	4.2.2 3.5.1 3.4.2 4.1.3
585	<p>Runs the Rainbow Café on Waterloo Street. Customers are already asking them to rush their meals as parking is limited but one hour maximum stays will make this much worse. Other businesses will also be affected.</p> <p>Feels that traders are not being listened to.</p> <p>Owns a flat on Royal york crescent where residents are very concerned about the loss of parking.</p>	4.2.2 2 5.5

		The scheme will put everything that makes Clifton special at risk.	1
586		Cars already park in their streets in dangerous positions. This scheme will make it much worse. Accidents are bound to happen.	3.8
587		Owns a shop and flat above it. Does not understand whether residents are limited to three hour parking in shared bays or not.	3.3.1
		Often uses public transport rather than the car so needs to be able to park the car all day.	3.5.1
		Has a medical condition that affects her ability to focus on very detailed parking signs. The scheme is complex and will impact on her quality of life.	1.2.1
		The local bus service is unreliable and does not keep to time. It should be improved.	4.5
588		There will not be enough bays for the number of cars owned by residents.	3.3.1
		The operating hours have been extended without them being consulted. Their parking problems occur during the day due to commuters so this will have a big impact on their family and social lives. The hours should be uniform across the scheme and end no later than 7pm.	3.4.2
		There needs to be enough parking to enable visitors to wander round and enjoy the area. One hour parking is insufficient, especially at weekends. It needs to be revised and made more uniform.	4.2.2
		They have off-street parking so can only purchase one permit but other houses have been divided into flats with no parking that can buy three permits each. This is unfair. All properties should be able to purchase three permits.	3.5.1 3.5.2
589		Objects to the scheme because the plans are fundamentally flawed and are not workable in their current state. Urges the council to allow more time for a considered assessment of a more viable arrangement.	1.4 6
		Objects to the scheme operating on a Saturday and until 9pm.	3.4.2
		Objects to the one hour pay & display in the village.	4.2.2
		Objects to the permit charge. Paying for something which is currently free when there will be no real benefit.	3.1.1
590		The scheme will have severe implications for business in an already tough economy.	1.3

591		<p>Objects in the strongest terms as believes the scheme will 'kill' Clifton Village.</p> <p>Believes the implementation is undemocratic.</p> <p>Does not think there is a parking problem in the village.</p> <p>Thinks 9pm is too late, in other cities RPS's finish earlier allowing more freedom.</p> <p>The scheme will be expensive to impose and police and thinks this is a waste of money.</p> <p>Works for University of Bristol and knows many staff have to travel from far away and park in residential areas. The university is a major employer and income generator in the city.</p> <p>Poor bus services in the city will put staff off working in Bristol.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>1.2.2</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.5</p>
592		<p>Deep concerns about the RPS because including Saturdays is restrictive to friends and family who might want to visit.</p> <p>The price of the third permit is too high, much higher than in other areas like Redland and Cotham. This will put people off renting in the area.</p> <p>The scheme will not help the real issue of there just not being enough space when houses are split up into individual flats with several cars per flat.</p> <p>Thinks introducing pay &amp; display in the centre of the village will decrease footfall and result in loss of business</p>	<p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>4.1.2</p>
593		<p>Happy with the proposals and believes the scheme will work well in Victoria Square. In favour of a review in six months to check how the scheme is working.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
594		<p>Supports the principles of RPS but thinks it should be Monday to Friday 9am-5pm and three hour pay &amp; display everywhere will be less confusing than one and two hour pay &amp; display.</p> <p>Wants to know why charities are being given discounts when they do not pay rates/get discount and do not contribute to the exchequer. Other small shops and businesses in Clifton pay full rates and contribute to the Clifton BID. Charities should be encouraged to adopt best environmental policies just like everyone else.</p>	<p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.2</p>
595		<p>Objects as thinks the scheme is simply "robbing from the rich" with the profits going to "poorer benefit scroungers".</p> <p>Does not want to pay an extra £50 a year to park on the street.</p> <p>Does not think there is a problem with parking in Clifton.</p>	<p>1.4</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>1</p>

		9pm is too late and restrictive.	3.4.2
		Hopes permits are not issued on a first come first served basis. Wants confirmation that all residents' will be able to get permits and not go on a waiting list.	3.5.1
596		Fully supports the proposals for the area and Victoria Square.	Comments noted
		Traders have dominated the parking debate and the interests of residents get ignored because they do not have the resources to organise such formal campaigns.	2
		Wants the scheme implemented as soon as possible.	
597		Objects to the scheme as does not see how the scheme will benefit local residents or local businesses.	1
		Parking in the area has always been challenging but does not justify meddling by the council and it will make the environment worse.	1.2.2
		Alternative proposals need to be sought.	6
598		Objects to the scheme running from Monday to Saturday 9am to 9pm as thinks this is discriminatory and thinks this could be argued in court as other areas are only Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.	3.4.2
		Thinks they should get double the amount of visitors' permits with these extra restrictions.	3.6
599		Opposed to RPS as believes it will be detrimental to local residents and local businesses.	1.2 1.3
600		Mostly agrees with RPS but thinks some changes should be made.	Comments noted
		Does not agree with 9am to 9pm in Kensington Place because it is usually easy to park after 5pm. These hours will stop family and friends coming to visit.	3.4.2
		If the cost of a permit is to cover administration costs, then why is the cost so different between the first, second and third permit?	3.2.1
		Does not think the proposals have taken into account businesses which need to travel to other areas for their work, such as building contractors.	3.9 4.1.4
601		Objects to the scheme because of the extension of double yellow lines in so many places is entirely unnecessary.	1

		Permit prices will put residents and business owners under greater financial pressure.	3.2.1
		Shoppers and diners will be put off coming to the village.	4.1.2
		Cannot see any benefits to the scheme.	1
602		Objects to the scheme as believes it is not fit for purpose. Like to visit the shops and eateries and will be put off doing this if I have to pay for parking.	1
603		Fully supports the scheme as residents' of the village with two young children. Have been letter dropped many times being asked to complain. Feels their voice is not being heard amongst the alarmist traders and businesses. They do not speak for everyone.	Comments noted
		Feel the mix of parking bays proposed is correct.	
		Many of their friends and family do not visit as much as they would like because they know parking is difficult, this will make it easier.	
		Knows plenty of people who do not use the village because they know parking is a problem.	
		Have had problems with trades' people trying to reach their house.	
604		Feels the scheme is undemocratic as never voted yes or no. It is being pushed through by a mayor who was voted for by very little people.	2
		There is no problem with parking in Clifton.	1
		If the scheme is being done for general benefits to the whole city such as reduced congestion, then Clifton residents' should not have to pay.	3.1.1
		If the scheme is not just a tax on residents' then the cost should only be what it costs to run the scheme. It should at least be priced the same as other areas in Bristol.	3.1.4
		Thinks the business, tourist and visitor functions of Clifton will be damaged by these proposals.	1.3
		The plans are not fit for purpose and significant change is needed before they are.	4.1.3
		The scheme should finish earlier, at 7pm.	3.4.2
		Believes the amount of available spaces will be reduced on Meridian Place, Frederick Place and Wetherall Place.	1.1
605		Objects to the scheme because of the location of a parking bay opposite their entrance which will make access to their property extremely difficult. Needs easy access as has a child in a wheelchair.	5.12

		Thinks this parking bay should be moved or removed.	
606		Has planning consent for a new build on the corner of Percival Road and Litfield Road with a pedestrian exit and waste exit onto Percival Road. Does not want a ticket machine placed there or by the front door of 41 Canynge Road. Also have planning consent for a driveway to be installed on Percival Road, 14-18 metres from Canynge Road. The road is narrow so the space left will need to be wide enough to allow access. This is going to be installed within the next few months.	5.18
607		<p>Opposed to the scheme as thinks it will be bad for small businesses who will have to close meaning people will lose their jobs.</p> <p>Wants to know why we are making it difficult for people to come and see the Clifton Suspension Bridge as it is an international landmark.</p> <p>For many elderly people one or two hours is not enough time.</p> <p>The park and rides do not serve Clifton Village.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>4.2.2</p> <p>4.5</p>
608		<p>Objects to the current proposals for Gloucester Row as it will not make it easier to park for residents. The residential side of the street should be permit holders only with the other side of the road being permit holders and pay &amp; display.</p> <p>Would like to see local research data for Clifton.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>1</p>
609		<p>Fully supports the scheme.</p> <p>The two shared use bays on Clifton Road will mean two cars will not be able to pass each other and this will cause congestion. One should be removed.</p>	<p>Comment noted 5.18</p>
610		<p>Opposed to the scheme as does not believe there has been sufficient consultation with local businesses.</p> <p>Expanding car park arrangements should be looked into, there is no car park like in other shopping areas.</p> <p>Particularly opposed to having any one hour parking thinks two hours should be the minimum limit. One hour is not enough to visit shops and restaurants.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.2</p>
611		Believes some regulation is needed but not this proposal. 9pm is too late to have a scheme running and is restrictive to friends and family. 100 visitor permits will run out very quickly.	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p>
612		Quotes letter from MP Stephen Williams who thinks RPS schemes should only be implemented where people want them. Letter goes on to talk about protest talks and march which took place.	Noted



		Significant change is required to make the plans work. The scheme should not be in place until 9.00pm as this will affect evening visits from friends and family. The scheme should stop before 9.00pm and should not operate on Saturdays.	3.4 3.6
613		Objects to the hours of operation. A scheme that finishes at 9pm will kill the social life that many residents enjoy in the area. Suggests extra visitor permits are given.	3.4
614		Opposed to the scheme because they think it will make the village a less attractive place to come and spend the day, therefore having a detrimental effect on local shops, restaurants and businesses.	4
615		<p>Objects to the scheme because it will make it more difficult to visit facilities and friends in the village in the evenings.</p> <p>People may have to leave their jobs if there is no other suitable way for them to get to work.</p> <p>Worried about the effect of the scheme on Christ Church and other churches. Churches do not just open on Sundays, they open in the evenings for community events.</p> <p>If the scheme is aimed at reducing commuters then it only needs to be operation between 9am and 5pm.</p>	3.6 4.1  4.4 4.5 4.1  3.4.4
616		<p>Broadly supports the scheme as finds it difficult to park during the day.</p> <p>Disagrees with the one hour parking as this is not enough time for people to enjoy the activities that Clifton offers. Just because people can stay two or three hours, doesn't mean they will if they just need to pop to one shop.</p> <p>The 9am to 9pm operating hours are too restrictive and will negatively affect residents' trying to have visitors and the night life in the village.</p> <p>The scheme has removed a large amount of spaces which are currently used on Royal Park. The north east face of the inside bend has ample space for safe parking but has been designated as no parking at any time.</p>	4.2   3.4  1.2.1
617		<p>Has visited the village for over 40 years. One hour parking is not enough time to park, look around the shops and go to a café. Thought it was a government policy to try and help regeneration in local high streets with independent shops and this scheme is a direct contradiction to that policy.</p> <p>Walking and cycling is not suitable for everyone and there is no bus service from Portbury.</p>	4.2 1  4.5

		Have other areas in Bristol got the same plans to restrict parking such as Southville, Gloucester Road, Redland and Cotham or is it just Clifton that is being targeted?	1
618		Restrictions until 9pm are excessive and too restrictive. 5pm would be far more sensible.	3.4
619		Objects to the scheme as thinks it is anti-business and anti-consumer. Thinks it will do immediate damage to Clifton Village and have wider long term effects on business in the city.	1 4 4.4 4.5 4.6
620		Lists a number of professions which may find it more difficult if the scheme comes in including; architect, baker, optician, gardener, estate agent, doctor, decorator, teacher and others.	4
621		Does not support the proposals and does not understand why it is being forced through for the 'benefit' of the people when so many people are against the scheme.  Does not think the additional costs to residents and the cost of managing such a scheme will justify the end results.  Does not agree with the 9pm finish. Thinks Clifton Village is being penalised more than other areas.	1 2  3  3.4
622		Thinks the scheme is short sighted as already struggling businesses will be forced to shut.  The parking is not ideal at the moment but it works.  Students should be discouraged from bringing their cars to Bristol.  Local hairdressers are concerned as people have four hour appointments.  Park and ride and busses aren't suitable for everyone. Has elderly parents who is not disabled but cannot walk very far or carry any goods.	4  1  3.5.1  4.2.1  3.6.1
623		Changing the parking in Clifton will kill it off. The parking works well as it is and one hour is not enough to visit the shops, go to a café or get a haircut.  Objects because it will cause a loss of jobs, closure of independent shops, infringement of liberty and loss to the economy.	4.2  1 4
624		Dissatisfied with the proposed scheme. Many houses in Manilla road are split into flats and shared by professionals, not single families, which puts pressure on parking. The scheme will force people to pay but not guarantee them a space. At present, adjacent streets can be utilised but these opportunities for residents' will be reduced if they are made into pay & display.	3

		Does not think the scheme should finish at 9pm as this is very restrictive on friends and family.	3.4
625		There is the odd incidence when parking is hard, but most of the time it is easy enough to find a space. Parking is usually worse in the evenings.	1
		The main issue is with high density housing and the amount of flats in the area and having to accommodate all these extra cars from residents.	3
626		Concerned about how staff at royal mail office will get to work. Many live in the surrounding villages where there is little or no public transport and have to start very early in the morning.	4.3
		There is no parking for the public coming and picking up parcels.	3.3
		Restricting parking is going to make life impossible for those wanting to come and visit Clifton Village.	4.1
627		Objects because there is no evidence that the scheme is supported by local residents.	1
		No evidence that the Clifton scheme has been openly and properly debated with the whole council.	2
		We need people commuting to the city to work, employers bring tax revenue and spend money in local shops and businesses.	4
		With such low density sprawling housing, public transport is never going to be great. We need to invest in affordable parking and improving the green credentials of cars.	4.5
628		Wholly supportive of the parking scheme as finds parking impossible.	
		Thinks some parking on Mortimer Road should be limited waiting up to one hour, but free, for visitors. No cost analysis or comparisons have been done.	4.1 4.2
		Does not understand why the scheme should finish at 9pm, this is restrictive on visitors. 5 or 6pm would be enough to deter commuters. The scheme should not operate on weekends.	3.4
		Suggests that the first two permits should be free and any other permits should be given out on a case by case basis.	3.1
		Visitor permits should be no more than £2 for 24 hours.	3.6
629		Does not understand how one hour parking in Clifton Village is going to help businesses, shops and restaurants. It will put off visitors.	3.4
630		Concerned about the west end of Cornwallis Crescent where the road meets the bottom of York Gardens and the top of Granby Hill. Cars on York Gardens have started parking at right angles to the kerb rather than parallel and this is obscuring visibility. This has caused many near misses and dangerous situations. Double yellow lines are needed up to the dropped kerb.	5.18 6
631		Been retailing in the village for the last 40 years and worried about the negative effects of the parking	1

		<p>scheme. Agrees that changes do have to be made but thinks this is too much too soon. The plans are flawed and require significant change before they are viable.</p> <p>Many customers come from neighbouring towns and counties to visit the village for the afternoon so one hour parking is definitely not enough.</p> <p>Lots of staff are working mums and have to organise school runs and activities before and after work as well as do the grocery shopping at lunch. Doing these things with a family is not possible on public transport or on bike or foot.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4</p>
632		Thinks the scheme will strangle the businesses of Clifton. As a regular visitor but not a resident of Clifton, they will not be able to apply for a permit so will not be able to park. Has invested in a bridge card as uses the area so often. One hour parking is not enough.	<p>1</p> <p>4</p>
633		Supports the scheme as has a daily battle with commuters that often leave after 7pm in the evening. Users of GH Fitness also use a lot of the spaces in the evening despite the fact they should use Alder King car park.	Comments noted
634		Objects to the scheme as thinks the wishes of residents' and businesses in the area have been ignored.	2
635		Objects to the revised proposal to implement pay & display parking on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. This will unreasonably restrict the likelihood of permit holders and residents of the road being able to find a parking space.	5.8
636		Identical to objection 636.	
637		Joined the demonstration march as feels it is wrong to impose parking measures on Clifton Village. Does not live in the village but works in the village and the public transport is not good enough for people to get to work. There needs to be more buses and more routes.	<p>1</p> <p>4</p> <p>4.5</p>
638		<p>Always objected over the years to Clifton Village becoming an RPS. It will ruin the conservation area and thinks it is a purely a money making venture. Pay &amp; display machines will blight the beauty of the area.</p> <p>Where will people park to go shopping, go for food, meet friends and visit historic landmarks?</p> <p>Bristol is a wet and hilly city so cycling is not always an option. Public transport is not to standard.</p> <p>The 9pm finish is far too late.</p>	<p>4.1.5</p> <p>4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.4</p>
639		Objects to the scheme on Gloucester Row and Suspension Bridge Road as this is a residential road with no permit holders' only spaces. Can currently park on both sides of the road but will have to	5.8

	fight with others to get space on the south side of the road. There will not be many opportunities for residents' to park after they have paid for a permit. The south side should be permit holders' only or both sides should be shared use.	
640	<p>Travels from Downend to work in Clifton Village. Her husband is self-employed and provides entertainment and day centres across the city. Does not believe that the scheme will work because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They need parking for longer than two hours</li> <li>- There is no long-stay car park in Clifton Village and few pay &amp; display spaces. The nearest park &amp; ride serves south Bristol.</li> <li>- Her husband has to carry heavy items so needs reasonably close access to any venue but he is not eligible for a permit for this. There is nothing in place for him to continue working in the area.</li> </ul>	<p>4.2 4.5.2 4.3 4.6</p>
641	Same points raised as objection 639.	5.8
642	<p>The bus service is inadequate and unreliable to the city centre from the suburbs.</p> <p>The one hour parking is totally unacceptable. A simple alternative would be to place three hour parking everywhere. This will stop the commuter parking but allow visitors to come to the shops and restaurants.</p> <p>The scheme should finish at 6pm, not 9pm.</p> <p>The streets will be covered with pay &amp; display machines and other unattractive street furniture.</p> <p>Yellow boards about the scheme were put up before the scheme was even given approval to go ahead.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>2</p>
643	<p>Objects to the scheme as believes it is unworkable and flawed and requires significant change before the plans will work. Reducing the amount of parking spaces available will have a detrimental effect on the local economy.</p> <p>Limited time on pay &amp; display spaces will put people off coming. People can spend four or five hours in the hairdressers.</p> <p>The scheme impacts on people outside the area. I will no longer be able to drive to work and I usually go and visit my elderly father in Weston-Super-Mare after work and I will not be able to do this so often as I will have to bus home first. Colleagues that live further away from the city will have to leave work and find other employment.</p> <p>The scheme will only make the parking situation worse for residents. Fundamentally just not enough parking for the residents.</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3 4.6</p> <p>1</p>

		The scheme is not needed during the day, it is relatively easy to find a space during the day. The real issue is in the evening when all the residents are home.	3.4
		Thinks a congestion charge into the city would be a better way of tackling commuters.	1.1
644		Objects to the proposed parking scheme as there is already very little customer and employee parking in the village. Those who find a pay & display space will not have long enough to shop in the village.	4
		Suggests the scheme should run from 3pm to 10am.	3.4
		Hensman Hill should have shared use parking as not many residents live there and most have off-street parking.	6
		Life is going to be made harder as a working mother as they have to drop their child at a child minder on the way to work. There is no multi storey car park nearby or suitable public transport.	1 4.5
645		Dropped kerb is not shown on plan and permit holders' bay is proposed in front of it. Plans need to be updated. Does not want double yellow lines in front of driveway.	5.18
646		Unfair that residents will have to pay for a permit with a worse chance of finding a space than it is now.	1 3
		Businesses will only get a few very expensive permits which will make them consider whether or not to stay in the village.	4
		The provision of pay & display is inadequate. There are many major attractions in the village which need parking for staff and visitors.	3.3
		There is no car park or decent public transport to serve the area.	4.5 4.6.4
647		None of the houses on Northcote Road have off-street parking like many of the roads in the village, but it receives many visitors every day due to its location near the zoo and Clifton College. Objects to the fact that Northcote Road will not have any dedicated residents only spaces. Residents will have to compete with visitors.	6
648		Objects to the scheme as thinks residents' should be able to park for free. Residents' should be given free permits and those who are not entitled to a permit should pay & display.	3.1
649		Supports the scheme in general but concerned that many houses are split into flats and with up to three permits per household then this will make parking even more difficult.	Noted

		<p>9pm finish is too restrictive on family and friends who may need to visit in the evenings. This will also make it harder for restaurants in the village.</p> <p>One hour pay &amp; display will put people of coming to the village to spend money.</p> <p>High costs of permits put extra pressure on struggling families, the first permit should be free or very little.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.1</p>
650		<p>Objects to the scheme as thinks parking is adequate as it is. Objects to the cost of having two permits when they currently do not find parking an issue when they return home after work. Permit prices are much more expensive than in other cities.</p> <p>The restrictions for Worcester Terrace finish at 5pm on Fridays when the rest of the village finishes at 9pm and runs on Saturdays so people will park on their street when trying to avoid this. If being forced to pay to park on their own street then competition for spaces should not get harder than it was before. The hours should be made the same as the rest of the village.</p>	<p>3.1</p> <p>3.4</p>
651		<p>Objects to the scheme finishing at 9pm and running on Saturdays. This will be bad for local businesses and make it more difficult for friends and family to come and visit.</p>	<p>3.4</p>
652		<p>Objects to the scheme because there is no justification. The extended hours in the south of the scheme will not protect local traders during the day and the leisure economy in the evening as stated in the consultation information. A large proportion of spaces will just remain empty during the day when residents' are at work.</p> <p>The scheme is an unnecessary burden on residents and on public funding because of the costs to enforce and administer such a scheme.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>3.1</p>
653		<p>Does not want double yellow lines in front of dropped kerb. Originally asked for this during informal consultation. Permit holders' bays will need to start a reasonable distance from the garage to allow access.</p> <p>Happy about the hours of the scheme running until 9pm and on Saturdays. The scheme is for residents and they cannot park in the evenings and on weekends.</p> <p>All pay &amp; display should be three hours because one and two hours aren't long enough and it will make the scheme less complicated for visitors.</p>	<p>5.4</p> <p>4.2</p>
654		<p>One hour parking in the village is not long enough for visits in the area. Usually spends time and money in local shops and businesses but won't be able to do this anymore.</p>	<p>4.2</p>

655		Statement of support for the scheme citing enhanced safety for road users and pedestrians, managed parking spaces for residents, improved access for emergency services, reduced pollution and improved access for shoppers.	
656		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects about the financing of the scheme form the central budget.</li> <li>2. Objects regarding ease of visitor parking. Objects to complications of visitors passes upon informal gatherings.</li> <li>3. Objects regarding availability of evening parking – quotes Ravenswood road in Cotham as an example of evening parking pressure in an RPS scheme.</li> <li>4. Objects that the scheme will not alleviate bad parking habits by parents dropping off children in the area.</li> <li>5. Concerned the Zoo will suffer in visitor numbers as a consequence.</li> <li>6. Objects to the effect it will have on traders.</li> <li>7. Concerned the Downs will become a parking lot.</li> </ol>	3.1 3.6 6 3.8 6 3.9 6
657		Objects to loss of parking spaces on Royal York Crescent and points out that residential parking in the evening occupies all available space currently.	5.5
658		Objects to proposed pay and display bays on north side of suspension bridge road citing numbers of residential dwellings in the immediate area and current parking spaces available for permit purchasers as well as concerns regarding the effect of business permit purchasers in the immediate area.	5.8
659		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects on safety grounds. Uses Motorcycle most of the year for reasons of economy cites would be forced to use in winter that would prove unsafe due to unrealistic journey times by public transport.</li> <li>2. Cites journey times of public transport options says that he would consider using the park and ride should services to Clifton improve.</li> </ol>	1 4.5
660		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to loss of parking spaces along Royal York Crescent citing impact will be particularly felt in the evening.</li> <li>2. Objects to charges/restrictions for shoppers to the area</li> <li>3. Objects to cost of permits</li> </ol>	5.5 4.1 3.1
661		Concerned that the 'one size fits all' proposals will not address issue of congestion and car dependency and that independent business's within the village will suffer.	1
662		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to loss of parking spaces along Royal York Crescent citing impact will be particularly felt in the evening.</li> <li>2. Concerned that finding a parking space will become more difficult due to reduction of parking spaces.</li> <li>3. Objects to why scheme is going ahead with lack of public support.</li> </ol>	5.5 3.3.1 1 2



663		Expresses support for the scheme and the balanced design accounting for the commercial activities of Clifton Village.	
664		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specifically objects to one hour limited pay and display parking in Clifton Village.</li> <li>2. As a company director objects to the scheme in general citing the effect it will have on trade.</li> </ol>	4.2 4
665		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to being charged to park on the private road in which he lives</li> <li>2. States that the scheme is anti-motorist.</li> <li>3. Objects to consultation process of the scheme within itself. Thinks the scheme is undemocratic, feels people are not being represented.</li> </ol>	5.3 1 2
666		Objects to having to pay for a parking permit to park on own road without the guarantee of a space.	3.3
667		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to cost of permit when considered with general costs of running a car.</li> <li>2. Concerned about the effects the scheme will have on the local economy – wants more consultation with residents' and business's in this regard.</li> </ol>	3.1 2 4
668		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the scheme in general citing it's already difficult to park and now there will be a charge to do so.</li> </ol>	1 3.1
669		<p>Statement of support citing that opposition to the scheme is largely from the traders. States those traders derailed the residents' parking scheme proposals the last time it was broached. States that parking issues are the main reason people move out of the Clifton area. Asks that the scaremongering opposition to the scheme be taken on balance with those that support the scheme. Says that Clifton is overrun with commuter cars and the lack of parking needs to be addressed urgently.</p> <p>Percival Road is overrun on Saturdays by visitors to the zoo, Clifton College sports games and events at Engineers House, but the scheme is not going to operate on Saturdays on this road. Thinks it should be.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>6</p>

		Five hour pay & display parking will only encourage the Saturday visitors and employees to commute and feed the metres.	6
		Engineers House is causing a serious issue with its visitors who park over driveways, over corners etc. This is dangerous and would restrict access to emergency vehicles. More double yellow lines are needed to help alleviate the situation.	5.18
670		Objects to the scheme because the consultation process has not been adhered to and has been fast tracked by Bristol City Council.	3
		Wife works at Chesterfield Hospital and already finds it difficult to park. The scheme will make it impossible to park anywhere near the hospital and will have to seek employment elsewhere. Public transport is not an option because it will add two hours travel time to the working day.	4
		Both use the Nuffield gym, this will have to stop when parking is removed as paying to park is not an option.	4.1.1
		Uses the village to socialise, shop and eat. This will have to stop if they have to keep paying to park. It will ruin local businesses. The area has managed fine without a scheme.	4
671		1. States that there will be insufficient parking spaces for residents under the proposals and paying for the privilege of parking with no guarantee.	3.3
		2. Objects to paying for something that should already be included in as part of council tax.	3.1
		3. Objects to the practice of over-zealous traffic wardens currently and is concerned about this in the future.	3.8
		4. States that investment in a multi-story car park may be a better policy decision.	4.6.4
672		Objects to the scheme as there are many fundamental flaws in the proposed plans which are to the detriment of employees working in the village. The plans will mean they cannot park on the street within a reasonable distance of their office.	4
		Urges the council the reconsider the plans with proper consultation. The plans are not viable and require significant change before any changes are implemented.	2
		No direct buses from Bedminster to Clifton Village. The time and cost to get to work will increase significantly.	4.5
673		Objects to the parking scheme as thinks it is just a way for the council to make money.	1
		Used to live in Clifton and walk to work at the zoo but could not afford to buy a house there so now has to drive in after doing two different school drops on the way. Parking on the street is never a problem and cannot use the zoo car park as it is very limited with the number of spaces and they are needed for visitors. Will have to use the five hour pay & display and run out half way through the day to buy another ticket. This might be difficult if in the middle of an operation on an animal.	3.2 4.4
674		Understands that parking is sometimes hard in Clifton Village but thinks it is unrealistic to expect	3.6

	people to ration their limited visitor's permits amongst their friends and family.	
675	Lives in Chipping Sodbury but works at Bristol Zoo in hospitality. It is not possible to use public transport and get to work on time when starting early in the morning. Buses do not allow them to get to work on time. Works for eight hours a day and the pay & display will only allow five hours parking. So where will all the zoo staff park? Many live further afield where public transport is not an option.	4.4
676	Do not paint double yellow lines across some 60% of their house frontage. There is no reason for the yellow lines to be there. They reduce the number of cars that can be parked there. They will look ugly in a conservation area. In 40 years of living there, they have not needed them. Supports their neighbours at in having yellow lines across their driveway. Feels that the double yellow lines should stop at the boundary between their two properties.	5.18
	Harley Mews is an un adopted road which is half blocked by a planter which is paid and maintained by the residents. A decision was made in 2013 that the space in front of the planter does not need restrictions in front of it as there is enough space to park. The plans show restrictions in front of this planter and they should honour the decision made in 2013.	5.18
	We are concerned that visitors to south of Clifton Park on Saturdays and for all evenings will swamp our free parking streets north of Clifton Park.	6
	Christchurch Green should also be in the 'North of Clifton Park' area. This will make some 40 to 50 car spaces (circled on map) available during evenings and on Saturday free of charge. These spaces will be attractive for visitors to the Village. This will dampen the Village traders' concerns about potential trade loss.	6
677	Clifton is not the sort of place where people don't just nip in to the shops or drop their children at school. It is a place where they like to spend several hours visiting shops and seeing the sights. If one has to pay to park it will put visitors and locals off alike. The zone is not just around the shops but goes right through to the Downs.	4
	What about people trying to run businesses, it will kill the village off.	4
	The proposed zone stops just short of my road and obviously there will be overspill in my area, which will make our lives impossible. The overspill will make residents of other zones beg for controls in their area and the Council will 'roll out' zones all over Bristol.	5.2
	The meters and road markings will despoil the whole area and no doubt extra wardens to police the area.	4.1.5
	Residents cannot even go from zone to zone we are not all young enough or fit enough to ride bikes.	5.2

678		<p>Objects to the proposals and agrees with the Clifton BID who says the council should stop, pause and consult further.</p> <p>Concerned about the detrimental effect this will have on the village. The whole scheme is far too restrictive and expensive. No scheme should finish after 5pm. Most streets do not need restrictions on Saturdays. How are tourist meant to visit the village?</p>	<p>2</p> <p>4</p> <p>3.4</p>
679		<p>Objects to metered parking in Waterloo Street and metered parking only in the surround areas of Clifton Village centre.</p> <p>Waterloo Street is a small street often walked; to be in line with the proposal traffic should be discouraged from using the street. Placing parking metered spaces in the street will encourage shoppers and traffic to include that route in the hunt for empty spaces.</p> <p>The operation times of the metered parking restricts parking between 6-9pm; as a resident here I would need to buy a permit and pay for parking between the hours of 6-9pm on return from work each night. This is unreasonable and also does not allow for unloading and loading of my personal vehicle.</p> <p>I have also considered what this will do to the value of my property; parking was taken into consideration when I moved into the area, the next owner will do also. This is not going to be favourable.</p> <p>Suggests that Waterloo Street and the surrounding streets have the option of metered parking and permit parking. The current proposal is very much toward the commercial operations with no consideration for the residents.</p> <p>The Council have added parking bays in Portland Street, an already congested street.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>1.2.1</p> <p>6</p> <p>6</p>
680		<p>The operation hours should be the same as originally proposed and the same throughout the area. I.e. 9am-5pm Monday to Friday. This new proposal could have a serious effect on businesses in Clifton Village whose amenities we all use.</p> <p>We firmly believe that all parking Clifton Village should be for at least a minimum of three hours, not varying the time limits on different bays. One hour does not give visitors the opportunity to visit more than a couple of shops.</p> <p>On the original plans, there were bays on both sides of Grange Road from its junction with Mortimer Road – until it narrows before the cross roads with Manilla Road. Now parking has been eliminated on the 25 yards stretch immediately before the junction. This takes away a minimum of five parking spaces. There has never been a problem with cars parking on the east side of this stretch.</p> <p>The plans for Clifton Village are complicated and controversial; we are concerned the Council appear to be trying to rush the process, thereby not giving enough time for sensible residents and local</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>2</p>

		businesses time to make appropriate comment. We have been told that the reasons for the changes were because of comments/objections made by people. We struggle to find people who support them. If the Council are going to act on these proposals then in a democracy we need to know how many were received and what they were.	
681		The council has no right to make a private road part of the parking scheme. The council does not clean it or maintain it.	5.3
682		<p>Concerned about the effects of the scheme as an employee of the zoo. The zoo is a charity and relies on its visitors to keep going. There is limited parking at the zoo and therefore visitors and staff have to park on the neighbouring streets.</p> <p>See pay &amp; display parking is restricted to three hours. This is not enough time for people to visit the zoo. The time should be extended or maybe special tickets could be purchased online with a zoo ticket to allow for on street parking. Or the restrictions could be lifted during the summer holidays to allow summer trade to easily continue. Asks if the maximum stay can be extended to five or six hours.</p> <p>Many staff have no option but to drive. I live in Langley which is over 15 miles. It is too expensive and would take too long to get to work. Buses don't even run frequently enough to get to work on time. This is the same for many staff. Many volunteers will have to quit because of this.</p> <p>Thinks Saturdays should not be in the scheme. Far too restrictive to weekend visitors. Thought the scheme was about stopping commuters.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.4 4.5 4.6</p> <p>3.4</p>
683		We note with dismay that there will be no available parking within an appropriate distance of our practise, and that our very elderly patients are going to be unable to attend consultations. This will cause great distress to a large number of patients who have always attended our practise. Can we put in a late appeal to have a reasonable number of pay and display parking spaces available adjacent to Clifton Park Consulting Rooms to ensure that our patients are not put under great distress.	3.3 6
684		States that he has heart and lung problems that affect his ability to walk. Currently car shares with his wife and starts work early in the morning. The trains and buses are too expensive and do not start early enough to get them to work.	4
685		Has kept a close eye on the bus drop off point on Observatory Road and has only seen coaches there on three occasions during the Winter months. Even in Summer no coaches arrive before 9am or stay after 5pm. Could the residents have these vital spaces back after 5pm before 9am and during the Winter months.	5.8
686		Believes that the consultation has been flawed and is invalid because North Somerset Council have not been consulted when their roads will be directly affected. This is required under Regulation 6.1 of the 1996 regulations.	2.2.1

		<p>Prior statements and/or delegated authority of the decision-maker amounts to predetermination. Believes that the decision-makers do not have the ability to act without prejudice or predetermination when reviewing the statutory consultation feedback as they have been involved in previous proposals for a 24/7 scheme. Requests to know whether the decision-makers have been instructed to proceed with the scheme before reviewing the feedback. Believes that statements made by the Mayor amount to predetermination.</p>	2.2.2
		<p>The proposed TRO text should have been delivered by letter to all affected premises. This would have increased their accessibility to residents of limited sight, limited mobility and speakers of languages other than English. The single page notices reduced perceptions of the scope of the scheme and excluded vulnerable people from the consultation.</p>	2.2.2
		<p>There is no evidence that an Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out. Asks for evidence that the Equality Duty has been met.</p>	2.2.2
		<p>The consultation period of 20<sup>th</sup> March to 11<sup>th</sup> April is unreasonably and unnecessarily short.</p>	2.2.2
		<p>There was insufficient involvement of residents and businesses in the informal consultation. He lives in the area and did not receive anything about it.</p>	2
		<p>There is no evidence that residents want a scheme introduced.</p>	1.2.2
		<p>There is no evidence of congestion within the scheme area.</p>	1
		<p>The existing plans are not accurate. Cobblestone Mews is shown as having no waiting restrictions at both ends but this is not the case. Objects to any restrictions being painted on Cobblestone Mews.</p>	4.1.5
		<p>The scheme may reduce economic activity in and around the area. The potential economic impact should be better assessed.</p>	1.3
		<p>There are insufficient public transport alternatives. There is no public transport between midnight and 7am and no evidence that public transport will significantly be made. There is no rail service within the area which increases the need for road transport.</p>	4.5
		<p>The scheme hours in the south of the area are excessive and will cause hardship. The scheme should finish no later than 6.30pm. Only a minority of businesses are open in the evenings. Most offices are closed on Saturdays. The hours in the south section should be the same as in the north.</p>	3.4
		<p>The operating hours will deter key workers from locating in Bristol compared to other cities.</p>	1

		<p>The parking in Bristol will be more expensive than in central London. In central London many schemes finish at 6.30pm so at certain times it will be more expensive to park in Clifton than outside Harrods.</p> <p>The one hour time limit will cause hardship as it is not long enough to enable people to use local facilities.</p> <p>The lack of limited waiting spaces will cause hardship. It is not reasonable to reject limited waiting spaces because they are resource intensive to enforce. Requests that they be replaced with two hour maximum stay bays.</p> <p>There are no off-street parking alternatives which will cause undue hardship to people without permits.</p> <p>The scheme involves excessive road painting, which will impact on the appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The scheme may facilitate inappropriate residential development through zero-permit agreements for buildings such as student accommodation. Local planning should not consider the perceived ability to restrict parking demand as justification for inappropriate over-development.</p> <p>The Council's website should state whether the scheme applies on public and bank holidays.</p> <p>Bristol City Council should publish a 'parking and enforcement' policy to ensure that enforcement is carried out in a non-discriminatory and reasonable manner.</p> <p>The council is unable to provide adequate customer service to operate the schemes and to exercise discretion.</p> <p>Bristol City Council should offer the opportunity to apply for yellow line dispensations.</p> <p>Bristol City Council should clarify the removal policy of vehicles if a parking bay is suspended.</p> <p>Permit costs and hours of operation are designed to raise revenue not manage congestion.</p>	<p>1 3.1.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1</p> <p>2.2.2</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>2</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
687		<p>The scheme is experimental and written without any true understanding and consideration of the impact of this scheme on local businesses.</p> <p>Anyone with an understanding of our business at Litfield House Medical Centre, the number of patients who attend the Medical Centre, where they come from around the country and their state of health can see immediately that the proposed local pay and display areas within reasonable walking</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4</p>

		distance to Litfield House are too few.	
		There is no adequate public transport from north east Bristol to Clifton. Members of staff have to drop children places and pick them up and there is no public transport option for this. It is inconsiderate to assume that staff are or should be local.	4.5 4.6
688		Residents do not support the scheme. They are aware of limited parking when they move to Clifton but live there because of the community, diversity of business and heritage of the area. They enjoy sharing Clifton with visitors and welcome them to the area. The scheme will deter visitors and businesses will close.	1 4
		The scheme should be city wide if it is to be proposed at all, with equal terms and conditions for everyone.	1.1
689		Strongly opposes the scheme, as do most people in the area. Would prefer not to have a scheme but if it does go ahead it should not exceed Monday to Friday 9am to 6pm. Parking restrictions in the evening will restrict residents' social lives.	1.2.2 3.4 3.6
690		Objection prepared in consultation with Christchurch C of E School and Clifton College. The three schools support the intention to reduce traffic congestion and spend time educating children on environmental matters but believe that the process followed makes no allowance for the contribution that the schools make to the local economy and that the proposals followed to determine permit allocation are asking for too much change too soon. They will no longer be able to operate to the standard required in September 2014 as the majority of their staff will be unable to travel to work.	4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6
		The objections specifically from Clifton High School are: Their specific needs are not being considered despite them having provided detailed information on staff numbers, modes of travel and permits required. They believe they are eligible for 70 permits as they have 10 buildings. This amounts to a shortfall of 89 permits as they have 155 staff.	4.3 4.4
		They are located in a shared use parking area so should be entitled to a more generous allocation than other businesses and residents that do not contribute to educating local children or to the local economy.	4.3 4.4 3.3.2
		The TRO is in conflict with the standard school hours and staff do not have flexibility to change their hours or move their cars in the middle of the day. The proposal requires a wholesale change in the way that staff travel to work. The majority of staff live over 5km from the school and are not on main bus routes so the cost and travel to work times may cause them to lose not just teaching staff but the 25% of their other essential staff who are paid the minimum wage. There are no viable alternatives to staff that are unable to walk or cycle and find public transport is inadequate or too expensive. Schools are a special case and should be treated differently.	4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6
		Permit allocation should be based on square footage, employee numbers or business turnover. This	4.3



		<p>is unreasonable and undemocratic. The possibility of basing permit allocation on curtilage space was not made available early enough to enable the school to plan for this.</p> <p>A standard allocation of seven permits per business makes no allowance for the difference between large enterprises like Clifton High School and sole traders, mosques, churches, zoos or stadia. These organisations will be hampered by the limited availability of pay &amp; display spaces.</p> <p>The TRO is inconsistent with the Council's guidelines for parking for new schools which allows for one parking space for every two members of staff. It is also inconsistent with the Travel West Travel Plan Accreditation Scheme, which looks for modal shift of 5-30% depending on circumstances.</p> <p>Clifton High School has been informed that they are eligible for 13 permits and six residential permits. They can provide five spaces for staff, leaving 141 staff members needing to make alternative arrangements.</p> <p>There is no data on the likely demand for permits or the number that will be issued or any additional spaces that may be free once students no longer park in the area and commuters who walk into the city centre are removed.</p> <p>They acknowledge that changes have been made since the informal consultation and that the scheme will be reviewed after three and six months but this would be followed by consultation which would mean that changes could not be made quickly enough.</p> <p>The school would rather provide space for play and learning rather than car parking but the TRO makes that the most sensible option, although any request is likely to be turned down by Council planners.</p> <p>The school will continue to work with the Council and other schools to further review staff travel, fund a travel plan, seek gold accreditation within three years and manage restrictions on staff so that single occupancy car journeys are reduced by 25% then 50% over a reasonable time period. However, the school requires the ability to apply for up to 70 permits in the first instance.</p>	<p>4.4</p> <p>4.3 4.4 3.3.2</p> <p>4.4 2.2.2</p> <p>4.3 4.4 4.6</p> <p>5.10 6.1</p> <p>2.1 2.2 6.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>4.3 4.4 4.6</p>
691		<p>Much of the objection is identical to objection 690.</p> <p>The objections specifically from Clifton College are: The school has provided the Council with detailed information on staff numbers and permits required and has requested 385 permits.</p> <p>The Council should apply discretion and treat schools differently. Clifton College has done everything it can to support the scheme but has been told that they will only be eligible for 42 permits.</p>	<p>See objection 690.</p> <p>4.3 4.4</p> <p>4.3 4.4</p>

		Puts forward the same proposal as set out in the last paragraph of objection 690 but requests that they can apply for a minimum of 300 permits when the scheme starts.	4.3 4.4
692		Residents of Northcote Road have suffered from very considerable parking problems caused by staff and visitors to Clifton College and by visitors to the Zoo. If he uses his car during the day it is extremely difficult to find a parking space on his return.	1.2
		Northcote Road has been omitted from the proposals and he requests that it be included to prevent the pressure on the road from increasing. Northcote Road should be residents' parking only.	3.3.2
693		Concerned that employment is being jeopardised by the scheme. Zoo keeping is not a very well paid job and has worked hard to get current position. Has to support a young family and cannot afford an extra £50 a month to use the park & ride.	4.3 4.5
		No direct public transport from Weston-Super-Mare. It is costly, unreliable and would take a very long time.	4.5 4.6
694		Objects to paying for parking outside his house as he is not guaranteed a space.	3.3.1 3.1.2
		Does not own a vehicle but would have to pay for any employees or visitors to park.	3.6
		The scheme will either lead to a clamping culture or there will be insufficient enforcement and the scheme will not benefit residents.	3.8
		Believes that Vyvyan Terrace residents own the area between the raised pavement and the highway and queries whether the Council can charge for parking there.	5.3
		The scheme is being steamrollered through in an undemocratic way.	2.1 2.2
695		Transport links are inadequate and should be the first priority. If affordable, viable links existed they would be used.	4.5
		Too few permits are offered to local businesses to enable on-street parking.	4.3
		One hour parking is not enough to visit shops and businesses.	4.2
696		Visits her partner three days a week and works in the area. Using public transport is almost impossible due to needing luggage for work.	4.3 4.5

697	<p>The proposals are flawed and unworkable.</p> <p>One hour parking is not enough, it will discourage people from visiting and doing business in Clifton.</p> <p>It will make it difficult for friends and family to visit.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>3.6</p>
698	<p>There is not enough space nearby for residents of her street to park. Is unsure whether the permit will only be valid for her road, surrounding roads or the wider area. They might also cause arguments between neighbours as everyone will have paid and will demand a space to park in.</p>	3.3.1
699	<p>There is no need for the scheme to be extended beyond 5pm and on Saturdays. This will only generate income for the Council. No-one will be able to visit without buying a ticket and it will have a damaging effect on local business.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.1.1</p>
700	<p>Runs a B&amp;B, which will be damaged by the scheme as customers will be unable to park.</p> <p>30 out of 75 nearby parking spaces will be pay &amp; display only and there are 69 residential properties competing for the remaining spaces.</p> <p>30-40 spaces will be removed from Royal York Crescent and there will be extra pressure from residents of The Paragon and Princess Victoria Street.</p> <p>Residents who have paid for a permit should not also have to pay &amp; display.</p> <p>The design is out of keeping with the conservation area; a telephone system would be preferable to installing pay &amp; display machines.</p> <p>The scheme should not be extended beyond Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.3.4</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>5.5</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.4</p>
701	<p>The problem is insufficient parking spaces given the high density of the residential area and the number of visitors to the area. These proposals do not address this. A new off-street car park for visitors is needed.</p> <p>The costs to residents and visitors exceed the benefits. It would be better to leave Clifton as it is.</p> <p>The scheme will impede people's human right of freedom of movement as many people have no practical alternative but to travel by car. In the absence of alternative parking for visitors, the scheme will be a disaster and will destroy the local economy.</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>6.1</p>

		<p>The proposals reduce the amount of space available, which will worsen the shortage of available parking space.</p> <p>Residents want people to be able to visit them easily. It is not fair to deter their visitors because of parking charges.</p> <p>The scheme imposes high costs on elderly people and others on low incomes.</p> <p>The consultation has been a sham residents have not been given options they would prefer.</p>	<p>3.5.4</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.6.2</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>
702		<p>Supports the idea of some sort of parking restriction scheme to remove parking by commuters working in the city centre but does not think the advertised proposals are appropriate as they will impact on visitors wishing to shop and dine in Clifton.</p> <p>Main objection regards the impact on residents living just outside the area. She is just about to move to All Saints Road and is concerned that it will be even more difficult to park there if this scheme goes ahead. Currently has difficulty finding a parking space if she moves her car during the day and fears this will get worse.</p> <p>Has previously lived in London where a scheme only operated for half an hour a day. This worked very well because it stopped commuters catching the Tube from parking near her house but enabled residents and visitors to the area to come and go.</p>	<p>4.1.3</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>3.4.4</p> <p>3.4.5</p>
703		<p>Is looking forward to the introduction of the scheme as it will benefit residents and businesses.</p> <p>Requests that the one hour maximum stay bays are increased to two hours to achieve the greatest benefit.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>4.2</p>
704		<p>The scheme will not achieve the purpose set out in the Statement of Reasons. She is regularly unable to enter or exit her driveway due to both legally parked cars and cars parked on the pavement.</p> <p>Clifton Park Road should be a one way street with cars entering the south end on Clifton Park and exiting onto the north end into Percival Road.</p> <p>The section between the south end and the swimming pool is so narrow that the emergency services are unable to access it with cars parked on both sides of the road. It is also dangerous for schoolchildren and pedestrians. Parking should only be permitted on the western side of the road and should be residents only with a drop off zone for the school and swimming pool. The current</p>	<p>5.18</p> <p>6</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>6</p>

		<p>proposals will not make it easier for residents to park and will maintain an unsafe system.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay time should be extended as it is far too short for visitors to shop or enjoy the Village. At least two hours is needed.</p> <p>Residents in the northern section will find it very difficult to park on Saturdays as the restrictions do not apply there then whereas the southern section is restricted. Cars will circulate in these residential streets and turn them into a free shoppers' car park. Parking restrictions should be applied to both zones on Saturdays.</p> <p>Clifton does need a proper parking system but more consultation and consideration is needed to enable future generations to enjoy the Village.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>1. 2.1 2.2</p>
705		<p>Alternative modes of transport involve an unreasonable increase in journey time or cost.</p> <p>Alternative parking arrangements such as pay &amp; display or parking spaces that incur a charge would involve an unreasonable increase in cost.</p> <p>The amount of permits issued will prevent the scheme from achieving some of its aims, such as reducing congestion. Most streets will be as congested as they are now whereas others, such as the street where he always parks, will be empty as people in his situation will be unable to park there.</p> <p>The scheme is an unreasonable attack on commuters and, therefore, businesses. These commuters are important to the city and both generate and spend money in Bristol.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.1 4.1.2</p> <p>4.4 3.5</p> <p>1.1 4.4</p>
706		Frequently visits Clifton. The scheme will reduce footfall and damage businesses unless additional parking facilities are provided.	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3 4.6.4</p>
707		<p>Splitting Clifton Village from Clifton East will penalise business trade in both areas.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay will cause a loss in trade.</p> <p>Inadequate transport links between Clifton Village and the rest of Bristol will deter visitors and make it difficult for staff to travel to work.</p>	<p>5.2 4.1.3 1.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p>
708		Paying for the scheme will make their lives more difficult. Rents his flat and does not have any spare money to pay for the scheme. His girlfriend and family are also concerned as they would have to catch three different buses to get there. 50 visits a year is not enough.	<p>1.2 3.1.2 4.5 3.6.2</p>

		Most of the streets he parks in now are in the Cliftonwood & Hotwells scheme. As he will be unable to park there this then it will still be difficult to find somewhere to park.	5.2
		The scheme will not work as the problems are caused by residents having too many cars.	3.5
709		Owns Arch House deli and believes that significant change is needed to make the plans viable.	Comments noted
		The fast tracked consultation process meant that they missed a crucial informal consultation stage and the proposal is flawed as a result. The parking for visitors is far too limited and the maximum waiting time of one hour is insufficient.	2.1.1
		The scheme should have more shared parking bays in Victoria Square; at the moment it is all residents' only.	3.3.1
		There need to be more options to bring people to Clifton, such as more buses, better park & ride, a car park and secure cycle parking.	4.5
		A scheme could be good for Clifton Village but it needs t take everyone's needs into account.	2.1 2.2
710		Supports the proposals.	Comments noted
		Has a child that attends school in Clifton and the volume of traffic makes walking or cycling to school hazardous. The scheme will reduce circulating traffic and remove the problems caused by vehicles parking on corners and pavements.	
		Has experienced the benefits that the Kingsdown scheme has brought to residents and to traders thanks to short stay parking outside shops.	
711		The scheme will bring no benefit as the local businesses he uses will close, he will have to pay £72 for a permit that will not guarantee a parking space and will cause him financial problems. Would get a bus if they weren't always going up in price.	1.3 4.5 3.1.2 3.2.1
712		Objects to the proposed pay & display outside 6 Gordon Road (Clifton Children's House Montessori Pre-School which she is writing on behalf of).	5.16
		TRO 1340 was only implemented in march 2014 although it was sealed last October. It provides a dropping off and picking up facility for parents with a maximum waiting time of 15 minutes. It was a positive move and a condition of their planning permission.	5.16

	The facility will be changed to pay & display with free parking of up to 30 minutes. She is concerned that this will not be available for parents as others will be using it. Asks that it be changed to a maximum free waiting time of 15 minutes.	5.16
713	<p>There has been no investigation of current road use and parking patterns. Without this there can be no understanding of how the proposal will affect the area and no means of judging whether it succeeds in its aims.</p> <p>The changes have been proposed without consulting families and without taking into account the impact that it will have on them.</p> <p>It would be more cost effective and beneficial to significantly reduce the cost of public transport, provide free transport for school children and install safe cycle paths.</p> <p>The scheme is so unpopular and undemocratic that it will be reversed by the next person in charge of the city. The money would be better spent on other local initiatives.</p> <p>Requests that double yellow lines stop at her driveway and commence after it, leaving the space unrestricted.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2.1 2.2 3.1.1</p> <p>5.18</p>
714	<p>Objects to the scheme because it is flawed and has not been carefully thought out. The scheme will have a detrimental effect on local businesses and will have an adverse effect on parking in neighbouring areas.</p> <p>The current parking schemes that have already been introduced have not been reviewed into their effectiveness. All they are doing is pushing the problem further out. The streets are just lines with empty parking spaces which should be being utilised.</p> <p>No extra public transport has been put in place.</p>	<p>1 4.1.3</p> <p>1 6</p> <p>4.5</p>
715	<p>The scheme does not need to extend until 9pm each evening. This will make it difficult for friends and family to visit. A Monday to Friday scheme ending at 6pm would be better.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay is insufficient for people having their hair done or going for lunch. It should be at least two hours.</p> <p>Requests double yellow lines extend in front of their house but not their driveway.</p>	<p>3.4 3.6</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>5.18</p>
716	Conducts weekly clinics from Litfield House and shops in the area. He will relocate if he cannot obtain a permit which was damage Litfield House and result in loss of income to local business.	4.3 3.7
717	Requests that the shared use parking place outside her property is converted to permit holders only. Many of the residents are elderly and are worried that they will not be able to park close to their house and will struggle with shopping etc.	3.3.1

718	<p>Requests that the proposed one hour maximum stay is extended to three hours to enable people to shop, have lunch and enjoy the Village.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay will create a ghost town and will be detrimental to the efforts to build a sustainable, thriving community.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.2 4.1.3 4.1.1</p>
719	<p>Agree with the proposed parking restrictions on Richmond Hill.</p> <p>Requests more free visitors' permits to compensate for the longer hours of the scheme.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>3.6.2</p>
720	<p>Owns the garage on Frederick Place – the second garage from the junction with Richmond Hill.</p> <p>Requests that double yellow lines are removed from outside the garage.</p>	5.18
721	<p>Public transport should be improved to coincide with parking changes. A bus link between Gloucester Road and Clifton would reduce car use.</p>	4.5
722	<p>Is finding it difficult to park in Cornwallis Crescent since the new parking bays and double yellow lines were implemented.</p>	5.1
723	<p>The scheme is flawed, has not properly assessed vehicular use in Clifton Village and provides insufficient evidence to justify the claims of the benefits that it will bring. It does not support the aims of section 1 of the RTRA 1984 for the reason below. It will encourage dropping off on corners to avoid paying to park, which is dangerous. If more people walk into Clifton Village from farther afield this will increase risk to those people. Clifton Village has insufficient pedestrian infrastructure to accommodate them. A parked car presents no danger to anybody so people continuing to park as they do now but being charged for it does not avoid danger.</p> <p>This a primarily residential area and residents will still need their cars. Charging people to park will not prevent them from driving. Charging cannot be justified. Parking outside a residency is an entitlement justified by paying council tax and vehicle excise duty.</p> <p>A resident parking a vehicle outside their home is the most suitable use of the road so the scheme will not prevent the use of the road by unsuitable vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The scheme will not improve the amenities of the area. Decreasing charges and restrictions has increased visitor numbers in Swindon. There will be an environmental and aesthetic cost and no</p>	<p>4.1.1 1.4 4.2.5</p> <p>3.1 3.2.1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>1.3 1.4</p>



		<p>benefit.</p> <p>Charging for parking and encouraging dropping off and picking up will not improve air quality.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons refers to maximising parking 'turn over' which demonstrates that the scheme is revenue raising and that It will offer no benefits to residents who already park outside their home but now have to pay to do so.</p> <p>It will not make it easier for visitors to park as they will have to pay.</p> <p>Rides a motorbike and asks how this will be affected by the scheme.</p> <p>The first permit charge should not be linked to vehicle excise duty. A car will fill exactly the same space, drive at exactly the same speed and create the same traffic conditions regardless of the emissions it produces.</p> <p>The protests against the scheme have demonstrated that the scheme is fundamentally flawed. It requires significant change to make it fundamentally acceptable, helpful or moral. It is not currently fit for purpose and does not have a purpose.</p>	<p>4.1.1.</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.2.6</p> <p>3.2.3</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>
724		<p>The scheme is flawed because there have been no significant improvements in other modes of transport. There are no safe cycle lanes and public transport is unreliable and expensive.</p> <p>If there needs to be a scheme at all, it should be for two hours at the start of the working day, as in London.</p> <p>The restrictions will severely affect business in the area. People will be deterred from visiting unless they are within walking distance and this will affect the local economy.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>3.4.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>1.3</p>
725		<p>Preventing the free movement of cars will cause the demise of the local economy as has happened in other towns and cities. A far more relaxed approach is needed.</p>	<p>1.1</p>
726		<p>The roads near to his house (Litfield Place, Camp Road, Percival Road, Canynge Road) are not busy and there is never any problem parking.</p> <p>Does not own a car but feels the scheme is unnecessary and will be costly when he has visitors.</p> <p>The scheme will not reduce traffic as it is very quiet on the roads mentioned above.</p>	<p>1.2.2</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>1.2.2</p>

		<p>Many people visit Clifton by bus. He believes that the parked cars belong to residents so the RPS will not reduce parking significantly.</p> <p>He is two miles away from the centre and major offices. There are no commuters parking near him. There is no evidence that the scheme will reduce unnecessary journeys.</p>	<p>3.5 1.2</p> <p>1.</p>
727		<p>Agrees with the concerns expressed by businesses. Suggests a ticket display system that extends the free waiting time to one or two hours.</p> <p>Relating the permit price to vehicle emissions seems punitive given the higher tax that the drivers of those vehicles already pay.</p> <p>The maximum stay variance of 1, 2 and 3 hours is unnecessarily confusing.</p> <p>Questions whether it is necessary to for the scheme to operate until 9pm in the south of the area. A start time of 10am rather than 9am would be better for residents.</p> <p>The scheme will reduce the overall amount of parking, thus reducing supply and making the problem worse.</p>	<p>4.1.2</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4 3.4.4 3.4.5</p> <p>1.2 1.3</p>
728		<p>One hour parking in Clifton Village has incensed dozens of his tenants.</p>	<p>4.2</p>
729		<p>Does not see the need for a scheme. Lives on the very edge of the zone and will no longer be able to park in Sion Hill as it is a separate zone. There will obviously be more people needing to park in Clifton than there are spaces.</p> <p>The 9am-9pm hours are unnecessary. It will not work for visitors. A shorter period would be much better. Many visitors' permits will be needed and the cost of these is likely to increase. His elderly parents cannot walk very far and now they will be unable to park nearby.</p> <p>There needs to be a scheme that provides alternatives for commuters.</p>	<p>1. 3.5 3.3 5.2</p> <p>3.6.2 3.4 1.2</p> <p>4.5 4.6 4.3</p>
730		<p>The scheme will be detrimental to the future of the Village.</p> <p>The Village is full of independent small businesses and this scheme contradicts Government initiatives to support small businesses.</p>	<p>1.2 1.3</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3 6.1</p>
731		<p>Writing in support of the scheme, which is an improvement that is long overdue.</p>	<p>Comments</p>

			noted
732		Writing in total support of the scheme, which will bring greater pedestrian safety, easier and safer access for emergency vehicles, abundant short stay parking of up to five hours and enhanced quality of life with reduced air pollution. It will also make it easier to tackle congestion and will make it easier for tradespeople to park when working on properties in the area.	1.2 1.3
733		Believes that something needs to be done to control the parking situation in Clifton Village but wants to raise some key issues.	1.1
		Believes that more disabled bays could be added – her wheelchair bay is not shown.	4.2.6 6.2
		Understands the intention of the one hour maximum stay is to improve turnover but this won't work. The type of short-stay shopping, e.g. grocery shopping, is usually done by people that live locally and walk, whereas the visitors that come to shop will want to browse and stay for longer.	4.2 4.1.1
		Does not understand why pay & display applies from 6pm to 9pm. It would be better if it finished at 6pm.	3.4
734		Feels the scheme impacts negatively on the zoo.	1.3
		Lives in Whitehall so would have to get two buses to work which will take over 90 minutes. Household costs would go up as currently car shares with partner. Does not feel safe cycling on Bristol roads.	4.6
		The zoo is a charity which relies on its visitors as it gets no financial support from anywhere else. The zoo car parks can only cater for half the visitors that come on busy days.	1.3
		The policy is rushed and not thought out. It may work in some parts of the city but it should not just be rolled out everywhere.	1
735		The current proposal is not fit for purpose. It will not meet its objectives as it will reduce access to parking for a significant number of residents, provide insufficient parking for businesses and make access for emergency vehicles more difficult.	3.3 4.3 1.4
		Local traders have experienced both one hour and two hour limited waiting and are massively in favour of two hours or an extension to three hours.	4.2
		The hours of operation do not need to extend beyond 7pm. The 9pm finish will force some residents with permits to pay again using p&d as there will be nowhere else to park.	3.4
		Where roads are designated PPAs without double yellow lines this will cause anti-social parking and	1.4

		<p>make emergency vehicle access harder.</p> <p>Requests increased flexibility of pay &amp; display via a telephone system rather than machines on street. It no machines, visitor spaces could be distributed more equally throughout the area and the system could become more flexible, for example by enabling visitor permits to be electronic.</p> <p>Wants double yellow lines retained over garage in the Paragon.</p>	<p>4.1.5</p> <p>5.6</p>
736		Charging for parking will deter visitors and businesses from one of the most vibrant areas of the city.	4.1.1 1.3
737		Objects to the pay & display only on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. Gloucester Row, Beaufort Buildings and the Guardian Court retirement complex comprise 65 dwellings, one public house and one professional accountancy firm but have only 57 spaces available to residents and businesses. Suspension Bridge Road should be reinstated as a shared pay & display and permit holders facility in line with the original proposals.	5.8
738		<p>They agree with having a scheme because of the commuters working in the city centre parking all day in Clifton. However, they object to elements of the proposals.</p> <p>The scheme does not need to extend until 9pm to deter commuters. There are insufficient visitors' permits available to cater for this. It should be free after 6pm.</p> <p>The cost should be the same per permit. It is unfair that the second permit costs more when two cars per household is an average in many surveys. They do not have two cars but believe it to be unfair.</p> <p>The streets in the heart of the Village are different to where they live and need to be considered differently. Residents there are not expecting to park easily whilst employees of businesses are. Businesses should be given a suitable number of permits to cater for their staff and pay &amp; display should not be imposed on them.</p> <p>The pay &amp; display proposed on the Promenade imposes a cost but delivers no benefits. Many businesses have car parks but not enough spaces for all of their staff so there is some overflow onto the street but it is usually easy to find a space. Spaces that are not costly or time limited should be provided here.</p> <p>Whilst no proposal will please everyone, the scheme needs to be designed so as not to be detrimental to businesses or to the social lives of residents.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>4.3 3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.2 4.1.1</p> <p>1.2 1.3</p>
739		<p>Broadly approve of the proposal apart from two key issues.</p> <p>The proposed one hour parking limit will cause problems for shops and businesses. Whilst there are some two and three hour spaces, there are not enough.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>4.2</p>

		The streets north of Clifton Park will be swamped by evening and weekend visitors.	3.4 3.3.1
740		Believes that the option of 'no change' should be taken instead of these proposals.  Asks how a private road can be included in the scheme without being adopted.	2.1.1 2.2.3  5.3
741		There has been inadequate consultation. The public meetings I have attended have confirmed my concern that whilst the Council consider representations made, they have done so with a closed mind because they have indicated that the principle of parking restrictions being applied is not up for debate. Inadequate information into the effect of these proposals has been provided to enable proper consideration of these constraints proposed both for residents and businesses.  A number of businesses will be unable to operate effectively within the localities affected by these orders. These businesses are preparing vacate Bristol to enable them to survive and this is not in the best interests of Bristol.  Inadequate alternative arrangements for transportation do not currently exist. There are no plans as yet published to indicate adequate off street parking will be made available and plans for transport of people are not yet as sufficiently far advanced to enable parking constraints to be applied within the communities affected.  Inadequate notice for the property I own in Clifton which is currently tenanted.  Insufficient information or consideration has been given to the ratio of permits issued to the number of spaces that will be provided following the implementation of the order.  The implementation of this order must be delayed in order to enable the delivery by the Local Authority of the promised transport schemes to enable the community to function properly.	2.1 2.2  2.1 2.2  4.1.3 6.  4.5 4.6.4  2.1.2 2.2.2  3.5 4.4  4.5
742		Fully supports the scheme and asks that we proceed despite misleading information circulated by others. Believes that people's views have been taken into account following the informal consultation and that the proposals can only improve the situation as people are put off from visiting the Village at the moment because they cannot park.	Comments noted
743		Supports the scheme. Clifton Village has great shops, cafes and galleries but it is impossible for a family to visit by car at the moment as there is nowhere to park. The scheme will reduce overall car traffic, reducing pollution and improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists, whilst enabling those who want or need to park to do so.	Comments noted
744		Objects to the scheme because commuting from Bath would be impractical. Would have to get two	4.5

	trains and two buses to work or park on the Downs and walk and extra 30 minutes a day.  Thinks the scheme is ill-conceived and is trying to fix a problem that does not exist. Currently commuters park in spaces left empty from residents' which have gone to work.	4.6  1.2.2
745	Regularly pops to Clifton to meet friends for coffee, to shop or go out for a meal in the evening. The scheme will be very inconvenient so she will do her shopping and socialising in Bath if it comes in as it is easier to reach by public transport.	1.3 4.5
746	Supports the amendments to the scheme made after the non-statutory consultation and thinks that the proposals are about right.  Has concerns that the proposed five hour maximum stay bays on Canynge Road will be used by commuters attending Engineers House and the Hartnell Taylor Cook offices rather than by visitors to the Zoo. Requests that the shared use provision ends at the junction of Canynge Road and Cecil Road to deter this.  Requests that there are no double yellow lines across their entrance.	Comments noted  3.3.2  5.18
747	The plans are not viable or deliverable.  Chose to live in Clifton due its diverse retail outlets and the vibrant nature of the community there. Would not want to live there if the independent shops disappear.  The consultation process was too quick and resulted in the requirements of different stakeholders being disregarded. There was a lack of two way dialogue due to initial plans not being locally informed and the revised plans not being made available for meaning full discussion before the statutory consultation.  There is a lack of robust evidence underpinning the proposals. An impact analysis and robust data must be produced before proceeding with the plans.  Public transport infrastructure is inadequate. Better transport services and links to car parks are required before a scheme is introduced.  The plans do not recognise the symbiotic nature of the relationship between the large commercial employers and the retailers in the Village. If larger employers leave, the impact on retailers will be devastating. There will not be enough new visitors to make up for this loss.  Permit allocations for businesses are inadequate. It should be based on the number of staff and visitors, the type of work undertaken and the precise location of the employer.	Comments noted  1.4 4.1.3  2.1 2.1.3  1  4.5 4.6.4  4.1.3 1.3  4.3

		<p>One hour parking on the retail streets is unviable and will have a detrimental impact on businesses. The longer stay spaces north of the green will be taken up by visitors to the Zoo and will not be available for visitors to the rest of the Village to use.</p> <p>Any changes made in the six months review will not be implemented until twelve months have passed. Businesses may relocate before any changes are made.</p> <p>Double yellow lines are not placed over the drive at the back of the house on the plans and wants them to be there.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>6.</p> <p>5.18</p>
748		<p>Lives in Clifton and runs a flower shop on the Mall.</p> <p>The proposals will cause her business to close. There should be parking for longer than one hour. Too many parking restrictions from 9am to 9pm will destroy the Village.</p> <p>There is not enough room for parking on both sides at the top of the Mall. Two way traffic is needed as it is an entrance and exit to the Village.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>5.18</p>
749		<p>The proposals are unworkable and need significant change.</p> <p>They overlook daytime visitors who browse in the Village for a few hours at a time. It is assumed that they find it difficult to park but many of the cars parked in the Village during the day belong to them as residents have taken their cars to go to work. One hour parking will make it impossible for visitors to continue to use the facilities in the Village.</p> <p>There are not enough two and three hour maximum stay bays. The original proposal for three hour maximum stay bays should be reinstated. When people are paying to park they will only pay for the time that they need so the spaces will not all be taken for three hours at a time.</p> <p>There should have been a longer informal consultation period and more time taken to analyse actual parking patterns in the Village.</p> <p>Half of her business is customers coming for sewing lessons and workshops and none of them would be able to park under these proposals.</p> <p>Many of the local employers will be forced to relocate. There are inadequate alternatives for workers and visitors.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.5</p>
750		<p>Objects to the scheme as a whole and the proposals for Princes Buildings.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		Clifton Village is a unique and thriving part of the city and the proposals risk destroying this.	1.4
		Princes Buildings does not have enough spaces provided for local residents. They will have to pay again to park in the evening in pay & display bays.	3.3.1
751		Clifton Village had a lot of empty shops a few years ago and a lot of work has gone into building it up to the successful, thriving area that it now is. They don't live in Clifton but visit regularly to enjoy its amenities. Charging for parking will cause people to go elsewhere and businesses will fail. One hour parking is not enough and there are no public transport alternatives for many people.	4.1.1 4.2 4.5
752		Thinks the parking scheme is utterly ridiculous. The streets in Kingsdown and Cotham are always empty, wants to know what the point of that is?	1. 1.2 1.3
		Residents go to work in the day and other tax paying people park in the spaces they have left, it is congested but it does work.	1.2.2
		Tax paying, working people have just as much right to park on the streets when they pay high business rates and high tax on vans.	1.1 4.3
		The marking out of spaces is less efficient.	3.3.1
		Four or five vans come to the shop each day for about an hour or so to load up then go to different parts of the city to fit flooring. Often in empty houses where there will be no one to supply visitors' permits. Landlords often do not know about local parking schemes so will not organise anything. Already pays over £10,000 in business rates a year so will now have to fork out more money. Doesn't think this is fair.	3.3.2 3.9 3.2.1
753		Works for Bristol University in central Bristol. Stays with his parents in Henleaze during the working week.	Noted
		The pay & display restrictions are a disincentive for people spending a leisurely day in the Village.	4.1.1 4.2
		The restrictions will also affect people working in central Bristol where there are major employers such as the University and the BRI. The maximum stay times are clearly intended to prevent people from coming to work by car. The scheme represents a significant tax on people working in central Bristol and presents great difficulties for people who come from out of town to work. Therefore it will be detrimental to the city centre.	4.4 4.5 4.6
		Public transport should be improved instead.	4.5
754		Richmond Hill should be in the Clifton East scheme. Objects to it being included with a scheme that runs on Saturdays and until 9pm. This is really restrictive to visitors. Visitor's permits will be used up	5.2 3.6.2



	<p>in much less than a year.</p> <p>Hopes that the scheme will have an effect on the students who do not move their cars for weeks at a time.</p>	3.5
755	<p>In favour of the scheme but does not think there is enough pay &amp; display spaces for visitors of the village, especially south of Regents Street.</p> <p>Disappointed that there are no pay &amp; display parking places on Clifton Hill, Lower Clifton Hill and Heisman's Hill, especially as there are not many residential properties on these roads. Should at least be shared use.</p> <p>Pay &amp; display bays should only operate until 6pm and then become permit holders' bays after that. That is a compromise for residents' and businesses.</p>	<p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.4</p>
756	<p>Runs a business in Clifton Village. If local employers move away because of the scheme he will lose trade.</p>	<p>4.1.3</p> <p>6.1.3</p>
757	<p>Instead of proceeding with these proposals, thought should be given to other solutions such as permit parking only between 11 and 12. If something too restrictive comes in and businesses close then it will be too late to change the rules.</p> <p>Residents want visitors to come to the area. Shops and amenities exist because of visitors. Residents do not want people abandoning their cars in Clifton for the whole day. This happened recently when a car was left from 7.30am to 7.30pm.</p> <p>It is currently impossible to park close to her house in the middle of the day and the evenings are even worse. Does not support the protection of parking for the customers of leisure attractions because this does not give enough thought to residents. However, the current proposals feel like a tax on hospitality as having evening visitors incurs a charge.</p> <p>Partial day visits should be addressed to make the visitors' permit system more flexible.</p> <p>Implementing lines in the area will create an eyesore and removing parking from corners etc will have the unintended consequence of creating rat runs.</p> <p>Requests that the perpendicular parking at the start of York gardens and the junction with Sion Hill is retained. Removing them or creating parallel parking will cause problems for residents.</p> <p>Supports limited waiting rather than pay &amp; display. Paying for one hour of parking will kill trade.</p>	<p>3.4.4</p> <p>3.4.5</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>4.1.1</p>

		Parking should be free for two hours, which would also be flexible enough to provide for a friend popping in for coffee without using up one of the free visitors' permits.	4.1.2
758		Many of her customers drive to visit the Village. One hour parking will reduce how often they visit and the activities they carry out during their visit. It barely allows enough time for a coffee let alone shopping. People from outside Bristol will not come if the scheme goes ahead as there are insufficient public transport links. Even a 5-10% drop in trade will lead to the business closing.	4.2 4.5 4.1.3
759		<p>Buston Cook have specialised in commercial property agency in Clifton for 20 years. Not only do traders have concerns about the one hour maximum stay, but Burston Cook are aware of prospective retail occupiers who will not make a decision about moving to the Village until the one hour issue is resolved.</p> <p>Many shoppers need 2 or 3 hours to shop, have lunch, meet friends for coffee etc. This is the only way that small retailers have managed to compete with the internet. Retailers in the Village have worked very hard in difficult market conditions and any further impact on trade caused by parking restrictions will cause some to close.</p> <p>Many office occupiers are avoiding Clifton Village as a location due to the parking proposals. There is no public car park nearby and inadequate public transport links for staff to use. Five large office buildings within walking distance of the village have been vacated in recent years and one company considering moving to Clifton from the city centre has withdrawn from a purchase because of the parking proposals.</p> <p>The initial consultation process was missed by the majority of businesses because it was fast-tracked.</p> <p>The one hour limit needs extending to at least two hours and the number of permits offered needs to increase substantially.</p>	4.2 4.1.3  4.2 4.1.3  4.5 4.6 4.6.4 1.3  2.1.1
760		<p>The proposal is not fit for purpose and needs changing to make it viable and deliverable.</p> <p>The introduction of pay &amp; display will reduce the number of potential customers visiting the area and browsing. They will go to the city centre for convenience or Cribbs Causeway where parking is free.</p>	Comments noted  4.1.1 4.1.2
761		<p>The scheme is not fit for purpose and changes are needed to make it viable and deliverable.</p> <p>The initial consultation phase did not occur. Residents were denied the opportunity to comment during the formative stages.</p> <p>The consultation stage was one week shorter than planned.</p>	Comments noted  2.1.1  2.1.1

		<p>Asks whether it is correct that the consultation was shortened. Shortening the statutory consultation period invalidates it and there is no evidence that doing so will prevent the streets from being clogged with commuters.</p> <p>There is a lack of integrated transport links for business staff and visitors, the bus services are inadequate, enforcement of one hour parking will be detrimental to trade, limited permit allocations will limit work activities and social activities and there are no alternative car parking options available.</p> <p>Visits Clifton Village regularly and will not spend money there any more if the scheme comes in.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.5 4.2 4.3 4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.1</p>
762		<p>Concerned about the removal of double yellow lines outside the Cathedral in Clifton park. They regularly have large events/services which involve vast numbers of coaches arriving at the same time to drop off and pick people up. Where lines have been removed, cars could be damaged by coaches or people will have problems exiting the coaches. To have further lines removed would make this worse. Requests that the lines that were removed are replaced and that the existing lines remain.</p>	<p>5.18 6</p>
763		<p>Charging for parking will drive people to edge of town shopping centres where parking is free.</p> <p>Supermarkets should be made to charge for parking too.</p> <p>Meets a friend for coffee in Clifton but won't if parking charges come in. The buses are not reliable enough. Coffee shops will close.</p> <p>There should be at least one hour of free parking.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>1.1</p> <p>4.5 4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.2 4.2.5</p>
764		<p>The scheme will kill the spirit of Clifton. They should not have to pay to park in their road on top of paying council tax.</p> <p>Asks why the hours of 9am to 9pm are proposed.</p> <p>The scheme will damage the livelihood of the shops in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>3.1 3.2.1</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1.3 1.3 4.1</p>
765		<p>Works at Stride Treglown in the Village. Does not believe that a scheme is needed as residents have never complained about their staff parking on street.</p> <p>Believes that the Council does not have a mandate to introduce a scheme as it was rejected when councillors voted on it.</p> <p>The scheme does not consider the needs of businesses with premises in the area. His company relies on cars to get to sites and needs to be able to park to serve its clients. Suitable public</p>	<p>1.2.2</p> <p>1 2.2.2</p> <p>4.3 4.5</p>

		<p>transport is not available, it takes too long and they often have to leave to meet clients at very short notice.</p> <p>If their staff cannot get to work easily or park at work then they will leave and the company may move out of Clifton. The building will then be empty and business rate income lost.</p> <p>The scheme will increase the time motorists spend searching for a parking space so will increase pollution. There will be more vehicle movements as people seek to move their car at lunchtime.</p>	<p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.3 4.1.3</p> <p>4.4 1.4</p>
766		<p>The scheme is fundamentally flawed and unworkable in its current layout. The number of spaces proposed is reduced and there will not be enough space for residents. The proposal to extend it to all of Saturday is illogical and a disincentive for people to visit. There are not enough pay &amp; display only spaces.</p> <p>The number of visitors' permits is inadequate. Builders etc will be deterred from working in the area. If they do take on work they will add a significant surcharge which will have severe implications for residents.</p> <p>Runs a business from his house and holds numerous meetings from his office. Will not be able to continue to do so without adequate visitor arrangements.</p> <p>The initial consultation did not occur as the process was fast-tracked.</p> <p>Informal consultation took place but the time period was cut short.</p> <p>The Council are bulldozing ahead with the scheme before statutory consultation has finished. This is undemocratic.</p> <p>Asks the council to explain how plans for Montpelier, St Pauls, North Clifton and Totterdown were withdrawn.</p> <p>Conservation area consents should be gained for the works.</p> <p>Asks what alternatives are in place for commuters and how they are promoted.</p> <p>Requests the business plan for the parking scheme.</p> <p>Asks why the scheme is being forced upon residents and what benefits it will bring.</p>	<p>3.3 3.4 3.6</p> <p>3.6.2 3.9</p> <p>4.3 3.6</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>2.1.1</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>4.3 4.5 4.6</p> <p>1</p> <p>1 1.2</p>

			2.2
767		<p>The proposal is not fit for purpose and is based on flawed assumptions. There is no data to demonstrate the benefits of the scheme. The potential negative consequences for the local economy and community are clear.</p> <p>There was no initial consultation and only a short informal consultation.</p> <p>Clifton is a thriving community which is being threatened by this proposal. A one hour parking limit is not enough to encourage visitors to the area and without a dedicated car park they will stop coming.</p> <p>Parking restrictions from 9am to 9pm are excessive. There is a thriving restaurant and bar culture which will be undermined by the scheme.</p> <p>Proposed permit prices are excessive and enforcement overzealous.</p>	<p>4.1.3</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.2 4.6.4 1.3 4.1.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.2.1 3.8</p>
768		<p>The restricted areas are too large and only allowing one hour parking will have a negative impact on businesses. Coffee shops will close down.</p> <p>People working in Clifton will be forced to use unreliable and expensive buses. There are no direct links between Clifton and north Bristol.</p>	<p>4.2 4.1.3 1.3 4.3 4.5 4.6</p>
769		<p>The scheme is only required because of the Cliftonwood scheme.</p> <p>They have lived in the area for 37 years and have only once had difficulty parking.</p> <p>Requests that the scheme does not operate for two weeks over Christmas and New Year so that residents do not have to use up visitors' permits. There are never parking problems at this time of year.</p> <p>The scheme is not needed on Saturdays or after 5pm on other days. If these hours go ahead, residents should be given additional free visitors' permits.</p> <p>Requests that residents vote on their preferred hours of operation.</p>	<p>5.2</p> <p>1.2.2</p> <p>3.4 3.6</p> <p>3.4 3.6</p> <p>3.4</p>
770		<p>Anyone visiting Clifton in the evenings or on Saturdays will be forced to park in their street as it will be their nearest unrestricted parking opportunity. Requests that Worcester Terrace has its operating hours extended to match the southern part of the scheme.</p>	<p>3.4 5.2</p>

	There are only just enough spaces for all residents to park now. If they have to pay to park they should not have to compete with non-residents for a space.	1.2 3.3
771	Objects to draconian parking restrictions. Unhappy with road tax, limited visitor permits and a Monday to Saturday scheme.	3.1 3.4 3.6
772	<p>The most difficult time to find a space is on Friday and Saturday evenings when people come for dinner or a night out and park in the area. The scheme only covers daytime hours so will not help.</p> <p>Too many people can apply for a permit so the daytime problems will not be solved either.</p> <p>Transport links should be improved first. More buses should come into Clifton.</p> <p>Parking permit costs will encourage residents to drive to work to avoid paying.</p> <p>Shares a car with her boyfriend who lives in a different zone. They will need a permit for each zone and will have to pay twice even though they car-share.</p> <p>It is unfair to limit cars per household if young professionals are house sharing. House sharing should be incentivised.</p>	3.4  3.5 4.4  4.5  3.1.2  5.2 3.6 3.5.3
773	<p>The scheme is not workable and needs to be changed.</p> <p>It will have a negative impact on the neighbourhood, especially for small businesses.</p> <p>There are too many one hour parking spaces proposed. Three hours and five hours would be much better.</p> <p>Extending the scheme until 9pm and on Saturdays is unnecessary.</p>	Noted  1.3 4.1.3  4.2  3.4
774	<p>Works in a kitchen showroom in Clifton Village. Also has to drop off and pick up children at school so parks in Canynge Road. Cannot use public transport because of the school drop off.</p> <p>Most customers visit for two hour consultation appointments. One hour parking is not enough. People will not make more use of public transport they will make more use of Cribbs Causeway.</p>	4.3 4.6.4  4.2 1.3 4.5
775	<p>Owns a flat in Caledonia Place but lives in Luxembourg. Supports the proposals in general but has some concerns.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay is completely unworkable. In Europe, the norm is at least two hours.</p>	Comments noted  4.2

		Extending the restrictions until 9pm makes sense because of the evening restaurant trade but more visitors' permits should be issued.	3.4 3.6
776		<p>Parking outside her store is currently two hours. Customers wishing to park for longer can use any of the residential streets. One hour maximum stay bays are not workable.</p> <p>There should have been more consultation time. She is concerned about her own parking as she carries stock to make and deliver so relies on her car.</p> <p>Understands that residents find it difficult to park but they would not want businesses to leave the Village.</p> <p>Better transport links should be put in place before the scheme.</p>	4.2 4.1  2.1 2.2 3.3.2  1  4.5
777		<p>Usually parks on street and walks five minutes to work. If the scheme comes in, she would have to use the new 505. However, as she drops her child off at school first, it will be difficult for her to get to work by 10am. The 15 minute frequency should be extended until 10am as it is on the other park &amp; ride from Long Ashton. She will have to try and renegotiate her hours or find a new job.</p> <p>There are not enough alternatives, as there is no off street car park and her employer cannot get enough permits.</p> <p>Shops and businesses will find it hard to survive as they will lose trade. People will have to pay to use the new play park next to the Observatory and less people will use it because of this.</p>	4.5 4.6  4.3 4.4  1.3 4.1.3 3.3.2
778		<p>The scheme should not run from 9am to 9pm six days a week unless more visitors' permits are offered.</p> <p>Students and staff at the University are the cause of the problem. They should only be able to apply for permits if their names are on rates, water and electricity bills. They should use public transport.</p>	3.4 3.6  3.5
779		Fully supports the proposed scheme. It is needed to improve pedestrian safety, provide better access for emergency vehicles, provide short stay visitor parking and reduce congestion. This will encourage alternatives to car dependency and make it easier for tradespeople to carry out work without blocking the road.	Comments noted
780		<p>Has always been able to park on Pembroke Road or within one minute's walk away. Under the scheme they will have to pay but will not benefit. The scheme is intended to raise revenue.</p> <p>Asks whether they will be able to park only on Pembroke Road or on other streets as well.</p> <p>The information about permit charges was difficult to find. The proposals should be open and transparent.</p>	1.2.2 3.1  3.3  2.1 2.2 3.1

			3.2
781		<p>The scheme does not provide sufficient commuter parking. The few permits allocated to the company means that she will not get one.</p> <p>There are no adequate bus service links from North Bristol to Clifton Village.</p> <p>Cycling is not a feasible alternative as there are no cycle paths on her route, the condition of the roads makes cycling safely difficult, there are no shower facilities at her workplace and no secure bike parks in Clifton Village.</p> <p>She drives a SMART car which has minimal environmental impact. This should be taken into account.</p> <p>They employ people from across the South West so these employees need to drive to work. The nature of their work means that they need to travel by car during the day.</p> <p>They will only be able to apply for seven permits, which is insufficient. Permits would need to be fully transferable between cars.</p> <p>The new park &amp; ride will be useful to some people but it would be better to introduce something specific to Clifton rather than extending an existing route. There is no park &amp; ride provision for staff coming from other parts of the city.</p> <p>There was no initial consultation and the informal consultation was shorter than planned.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2</p>
782		<p>Objects to the scheme because as a restaurant the one hour parking will not be helpful. Will push away lunch time trade. Not possible for people to order, wait and enjoy their food within one hour. Many customers may also want to do some shopping in the village.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>1.3</p>
783		<p>Removing the double yellow lines on the inner circle side of The Paragon will result in the road being impassable. The current parking layout should be retained.</p>	<p>5.6</p>
784		<p>The Council should listen to retailers and businesses and should not implement the plans without taking their views into account.</p> <p>One hour parking is not long enough to visit restaurants or for tourists, shoppers and general visitors to enjoy the area. There are no car parks in the area except for the one run by the Zoo, which has exempted longer stays in nearby streets.</p>	<p>2.1.3</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.6.4</p>
785		<p>Parking restrictions will be bad for the whole community. There will be nowhere to park for people who want to have lunch and do some shopping. There will be nowhere for people working on properties to park. It is designed to raise revenue.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.1</p>



786	The footfall in Clifton Arcade is already sparse and implementing a one hour parking limit will directly result in a loss of trade. There are inadequate transport links for employees and for visitors and the small number of permits will make normal work practices impossible. The scheme will have a detrimental impact on the economic viability of the Village.	4.2 4.5 4.3 4.1.3
787	<p>The scheme will make no difference to the current situation except for residents having to pay. In addition, visits from friends and family will be made more difficult.</p> <p>The density of housing means that there will not be enough parking spaces even if the commuters, shoppers and coffee shop users are not parked there but she will have to pay. This is unfair.</p> <p>Restrictions from Monday to Saturday 9am to 9pm are too long. The whole area should have the same restrictions.</p> <p>One hour parking will cause trade to suffer. People won't have time to enjoy exploring the area so they won't come.</p> <p>She is considering moving away after 20 years because of these proposals. They will add to the cost of living but destroy the enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>It would be better to enforce current parking rules and fine inconsiderate parkers instead of introducing this scheme.</p>	1.2 3.6  3.3 3.1 3.2.1  3.4  4.2  1.2 3.1  1.2.2 4.1.2
788	The proposals are excessively complex and costly, they reduce the total number of spaces available, they will have a detrimental effect on local businesses, they do not guarantee a parking space and the arrangements for visiting tradesmen are not suitable. It would be better to increase the total parking provision.	3.1 3.3 4.1.3 1.3
789	<p>There are no real parking problems near Pembroke Grove. The only problems are those caused by planning permission being granted to convert houses into flats which causes problems in the evenings and at weekends.</p> <p>Some yellow lines have been removed, such as those on Pembroke Road. If this is to provide more parking then it conflicts with the aim of reducing traffic flow and making the area safer. It is intended to raise revenue.</p> <p>Pay &amp; display should be display only. It is cheaper to monitor by checking the ticket in the windscreen. The ticket could be issued for nominal cost to cover machine maintenance. The cost of the wardens would be neutral.</p> <p>Restrictions on Saturdays are unnecessary as there are no problems then.</p>	1  3.1 3.3  4.1.2 3.1  3.4

		The Council should say whether the scheme will generate income and if so the profit should be returned to the council tax payer.	3.1
790		Supports the proposals and believes that the scheme will make it more difficult for commuters and students to clog the streets.	Comments noted
791		Providing the same number of visitors' permits across the area when part of it runs until 9pm and part until 5pm is illogical and unfair.	3.4 3.6
		It is unfair that shared houses with a driveway can only apply for one permit whereas a flat with no driveway can apply for three.	3.5.1
792		The atmosphere in Clifton is unique. Everyone knows that it is difficult to park but you can always find somewhere.	1.2.2
		The proposals mean that no one wins. Businesses will fail and residents will lose out. Each individual will have different parking needs so the scheme cannot work for everyone.	1.2 1.3 3.3
		With the present system, everyone knows that parking is pot luck and part of living in Clifton and they adapt to that. Restrictions will destroy businesses and the thriving community will suffer.	1. 4.1.3
793		Owns a business and believes that the scheme will damage the independent businesses in the area as they rely on customers coming from all over the city and elsewhere.	1.3 4.1
		The 8 and 9 bus service is inadequate. Customers come from all over Bristol and have young children so are already struggling with buggies etc. They need a direct bus link. There are no park & ride services for people visiting from other towns and cities. The few services that do exist are too expensive.	4.5
		The one hour parking limit will damage trade. The spaces are used by residents and visitors so will reduce the number of spaces for visitors when residents use them. The longer stay parking is near the Zoo and will not help shoppers. The number of pay & display only spaces is far too low.	4.2 3.3
		Restrictions on a Saturday will damage trade. Parking on Saturdays is not an issue at the moment. Evening restrictions will damage the restaurant trade. This is intended to make money. It is not applied to every street in the Village.	3.4 3.1
		The scheme aims to remove commuters but as there are no alternatives to the car people will buy permits and continue to drive so the number of parked cars will not significantly decrease.	4.5 3.5

		<p>Alternatives need to be put in place before any scheme starts otherwise businesses will suffer immediately.</p> <p>Requests that all visitor spaces are three hours or more, that Saturday is unrestricted or offers longer stays, that visitors can use permit holders' spaces for an hour, that Boyces Avenue is unrestricted after 6pm and that more reasonably priced bus links are introduced.</p>	<p>4.4 4.1.3</p> <p>4.2 3.4 4.5</p>
794		<p>Objects to the pay &amp; display only on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. It will reduce the space for permit holders by 50% which will defeat the aims of the scheme as it will not improve things for residents. Requests that the shared use bays originally proposed are reinstated.</p>	5.8
795		<p>The proposal may solve the problem of city centre based commuters parking in Clifton but it will cause greater problems for residents and businesses in the area.</p> <p>The cost will be greater than the benefits gained. Commuter parking is not an issue after 5pm or on Saturdays. Whilst some of this parking may be removed, this does not make up for the loss of free parking for people visiting friends, restaurants and shops.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1 3.4 3.6 4.1</p>
796		<p>The one hour parking will directly lead to loss in trade as customers do not wine and dine in one hour. There are inadequate transport links to Clifton which deters visitors and prevents staff from getting to work.</p> <p>The scheme will have a detrimental impact on the local economy.</p>	<p>4.2 4.5</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3</p>
797		<p>Supports the proposal as it will bring long term benefits to Clifton. The parking situation now is worsened by commuters parking there and walking to the city centre.</p> <p>Visitors should be able to park for two hours to help them shop and visit local businesses. It is not unreasonable to charge for this.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>4.2 4.1.</p>
798		<p>Supports the scheme. Would like to visit Clifton more often but the environment is unpleasant as it is dominated by cars.</p>	<p>Comments noted 1.4</p>
799		<p>No provision is made for commuters and there is a lack of three hour parking which will affect trade. It might benefit some residents but it will affect the reasons why they choose to live in the Village.</p> <p>The consultation was fast tracked and a crucial initial consultation phase with businesses was</p>	<p>4.3 4.4 4.2</p> <p>2.1</p>

		missed. Proper consultation should be carried out.	2.2
		There is no parking provision for commuters, the park & ride schemes do not come to Clifton and businesses can only apply for a small number of permits.	4.3
		Accepts the principle of residents' parking but believes that this scheme will cause significant problems for businesses as there is no provision or alternative for commuters.	4.5 4.1.3
800		Believes there are insufficient alternatives to driving. Usually walks from Bedminster; occasionally catches the number 8 bus but it is always full with standing room only by the time it reaches the city centre. There will not be capacity for the increased demand generated by the scheme.	4.5
		Reiterates the concerns of Mazars as set out in objection 781.	See objection 781
801		Welcomes most of the proposals.	Comments noted
		Consideration of dropping off and picking up arrangements for children. Free parking before 9.00am is about right but the maximum stay should be 15 minutes. Free parking should return at 4.00pm.	3.4
		Multi-occupancy buildings will make the scheme a lottery with a disproportionate number of people being considered residents who are actually transient.	3.5 3.3
802		Residents do not want or need a scheme. The Council should spend its time and money on something else.	1.2
		Believes the scheme is intended to make money by charging for something that is currently free. If the Council wants people to use public transport it should make it more attractive rather than attempt to price people out of their cars.	3.1 4.5
		The scheme will cause serious inconvenience to residents and will stop people from outside Clifton from coming to the shops.	1. 4.1.3
803		Parking for residents is difficult at times, particularly during week days and weekend days due to commuters and visitors/shoppers. Traffic flow is not a problem as cars are driving slowly looking for a parking space.	Comments noted
		Putting double yellow lines on 50% of roads is absurd as it will reduce the available parking and create more of a problem.	1.2 3.3 6
		The area is famous for its shopping and cafes and by making parking more difficult the vibrant businesses will be lost.	1.3 4.1.3
		Does not object to restricting free commuter parking in Clifton but objects to paying for a permit when it is unlikely to improve the situation.	1.2 3.1

		Bristol needs much better bus services and more frequent train services on the Severn Beach line.	4.5
804		<p>There has not been a full consultation period with all parties that will be affected by the scheme. As a result, it will not be fit for purpose.</p> <p>Would hate to see Clifton Village affected by these changes and appreciates that something must be done but believes that everybody's needs should be considered.</p>	2.1 2.2  2.1 2.2
805		<p>Clifton is a unique, thriving village and will be destroyed by the scheme.</p> <p>Works in Litfield House, which brings in people from all over the South West and west midlands, many of whom use local shops and have lunch there. Parking will be restricted and expensive which will affect trade.</p> <p>Low paid workers will not be able to afford to pay to park. The bus is not the answer as she would need to catch two buses which would take over an hour compared to the 10 minute car journey. It would also involve too much walking. She does not qualify for a Blue Badge but would struggle to walk the necessary distance.</p> <p>Public transport should be sorted out before any scheme is introduced.</p>	1.  4.1 4.2  4.5 4.6  4.5
806		Lives in Nailsea and works at Bristol Zoo. She has to take her children to work and get to the Zoo for 9am, which will be impossible. Works part time so cannot afford the pay & display charges. They are also likely to be full before she gets to work. The scheme will stop her from working.	4.5 4.6
807		Works in Clifton and regularly goes to the Village. Shopping would be more difficult and visitors would be discouraged if the scheme comes in.	1.3 4.1.1
808		<p>Works at Clifton College and would have to walk an unacceptable distance to her car if she could not park outside. Starts work at 6am when it is dark during most of the year and is concerned about bad weather conditions in winter.</p> <p>There is no convenient public transport alternative. The journey would involve two buses and mean setting off before 5am. This would also be expensive.</p> <p>Is paid £6.69 an hour and so cannot afford pay &amp; display costs.</p> <p>The new park &amp; ride from Long Ashton would not help as it would take as long to drive to the park &amp; ride as it does to drive to Clifton. It would also be expensive and involve waiting for a bus in an isolated spot early in the day.</p>	4.3 4.4  4.5 4.6  4.6  4.5

809	<p>The one hour maximum stay will have a detrimental effect on many businesses that rely on people spending a few hours and browsing. The only ones that benefit will be the supermarkets who are already big successful companies.</p> <p>The scheme will drive business away and towards Cabot Circus or Cribbs Causeway. It may benefit residents in the short term but will have a negative long term effect as Clifton will become a ghost town. Bristol's uniqueness comes from the diversity of its independent shops and the scheme will destroy them. Even a small change can have a dramatic impact on independent traders.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.1 4.1.3 1.3</p>
810	<p>The scheme is not fit for purpose and requires changes to make it viable and deliverable. Works on Boyces Avenue and has worked for other retailers during the last 15 years, so is aware of parking difficulties.</p> <p>Is concerned that the permit only areas and parking meters in the centre of the Village with a maximum stay of one hour will discourage visitors. There are not enough spaces with not enough hours to cater for everyone and the maximum stay creates a time pressure that will spoil people's enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>Public transport is poor and there is no park &amp; ride covering the north or east of the city. Living in Kingswood, the time and cost of catching the bus makes it unviable. May be eligible for a permit but does not think that the cost is fair.</p>	<p>Noted 1.3</p> <p>4.2 3.3</p> <p>4.5 4.3 3.2.1</p>
811	<p>The scheme should not happen, it will only benefit the Council. One hour in Clifton Village is not long enough.</p>	<p>1. 4.2</p>
812	<p>The scheme is not workable as the revised plans are flawed.</p> <p>The scheme will make parking more difficult. Enjoys spending weekends in Clifton Village. It is possible to spend a day wandering round the shops, visiting the Suspension Bridge and eating in delis and restaurants. The scheme will prevent this.</p> <p>Her family usually stays in the Victoria Square or Rodney Hotel but both have very small car parks and recommend that guests find a space on-street. This will be difficult and off-putting.</p> <p>The wide range of independent shops will suffer if the scheme comes in. They have helped to create a thriving Village which attracts tourists as well as Bristolians. There needs to be a balance between residents and retailers but this is not the answer.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>1.3 4.2</p> <p>4.3.4</p> <p>1.3 3.3</p>
813	<p>Lives in Henleaze, which is too far to walk each day and there is no direct public transport link. Regular affordable transport links should be considered before any parking scheme is introduced.</p> <p>Businesses in Clifton will lose out if customers cannot park.</p>	<p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.3</p>

814		<p>The plans contain fundamental flaws. She will need to look for work elsewhere if it goes ahead as public transport would take an additional two hours a day from Bradley Stoke. There are no parking problems in Canynge Road at present as the residents' park elsewhere whilst at work.</p> <p>The scheme will push parking further out to other areas.</p> <p>Transport links are inadequate, too few links are being offered to businesses and one hour parking restrictions are too short.</p>	<p>4.1.3 4.3 1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>4.5 4.2</p>
815		<p>The scheme will jeopardise her employment if it goes ahead. She has asthma and cannot walk or cycle uphill from Bedminster. Catching two buses and changing between them on the Centre is not easy when it is windy, icy or hot with a high pollen count so she needs to drive.</p> <p>Bus travel would cost an additional £70 a month which would have an impact on her household's finances.</p> <p>A three or five hour parking limit would prevent her from working her 9.00-5.30 shift. Even if she could move her car at lunchtime it would cost £200 a month which is untenable.</p> <p>The one hour limit in the Village does not allow enough time to enjoy a meal, use a hair salon or browse the shops. People will go elsewhere and the Village will decline.</p>	<p>4.1.3 4.6 4.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.2</p>
816		<p>The basis for the proposals has not been established and the scheme is not workable in its current state.</p> <p>The consultation has been flawed and the comments raised not properly addressed.</p> <p>Employs 125 people in the north part of the scheme. 33% of employees have said they will consider finding alternative employment if the scheme comes in. The cost implications of the scheme represent a real threat to their business.</p> <p>The public transport system is poor so staff have no alternative but to drive. Their other offices have much better take-up of public transport and this is what the Council should focus on.</p> <p>Believes that notices and lines are being installed before the consultation ends. It is therefore not being carried out in good faith.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.1.3 4.3 3.2.1</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>2.2.3</p>
817		<p>Acknowledges that some amendments were made following informal consultation but they were not sufficient to address the shortcomings of the scheme and the concerns raised.</p> <p>The scheme is being imposed in an undemocratic manner. It does not have the support of the majority of the Council or those affected by it.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2.</p> <p>1. 2.1</p>

		<p>There is no evidence base for the plans and no modelling has been done.</p> <p>There is inadequate parking provision to accommodate the permit numbers proposed. There is no proposal to introduce additional visitor car parking.</p> <p>The hours of operation and periods of stay are not in the best interests of the area.</p> <p>Public transport does not provide a convenient, efficient or cost effective alternative to private travel and this scheme is proposed before any significant improvements are planned.</p> <p>The consultation process has failed to capture and respond to the views of those affected by it. It will be implemented whatever happens.</p> <p>It is being progressed to make revenue from loss making park &amp; ride facilities, underutilisation of Council owned car parks, the introduction of on-street parking charges and enforcement and fines associated with the management of it.</p>	<p>2.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.1</p>
818		<p>Inadequate transport links will prevent her from getting to work or from visiting other sites from her workplace.</p> <p>Too few permits are offered to local businesses to enable parking on the street. There will be nowhere for employees or visitors to park their cars.</p> <p>One hour parking is too short and will be detrimental to trade and the livelihood of the Village.</p> <p>There is not currently a problem as residents and workers can find somewhere to park so this should not be compromised for a money making scheme.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.1</p>
819		<p>Works at Hartnell Taylor Cook on Canynge Road and drops her son off at nursery before work. The scheme would mean she would have to reduce her work hours to get from the nursery to work on time and from work to the nursery by 6pm.</p> <p>Uses from Portishead take too long to get to Ashton Court, from where she would have to walk over the bridge to work.</p> <p>Driving to Shirehampton to catch the Severn Beach line to Clifton Down then walking would take too long.</p> <p>Cycling is too far and dangerous.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.6</p>



		Car sharing is not an option as a parking space would still be needed.	4.5. 4.6
		Could drive to Abbots Leigh and walk but this would move the problem to someone else's doorstep.	5.2
		The scheme will drive everyone out of the Village. Even the residents do not want it.	1
820		The initial consultation was not undertaken with the relevant stakeholders as required to the Informal Consultation proposals being issued.	2.1 2.2
		The consultation process period for Clifton Village has been accelerated, the result of which is a scheme that disregards the requirements of the different types of stakeholders across the CV area.	2.1
		The failure to engage the proper consultation has been identified by the Residents' Parking Cross Party Working Group, who in their minutes of their meeting held on 18 March 2014, Agenda Item 9(b) minute; "The group found that the rushing out of the various schemes without fully formed and presented data or proper consultation, including changes to boundaries, stages and timescales has made the subsequent consultation process difficult. This has led to a great deal of confusion for many residents and businesses in the areas currently being taken forward." The lack of consultation identified by Council's own Officers has resulted in the drafting of an unworkable Residents' Parking Scheme for Clifton Village.	2.1 2.2
		We believe that Bristol City Council under Article 7 of the Aarhus Convention are required to allow participation concerning the preparation of the plans, programme or policy in question "within a transparent and fair framework."	2.1.4
		To be effective consultation must take place at a time when there are genuine options still available and the outcome has not been determined. We believe the Mayor has made his position clear on the implementation of the RPS schemes in an article written by the Mayor and published in the Bristol evening post on 1 <sup>st</sup> of June 2013, he said "the principle which is a strategic one, is not up for negotiation." We believe the Mayor has predetermined the implementation of the Residents' Parking Scheme prior to consultation.	2.1 2.2
		The informal consultation period was reduced by 1 week due to Bristol City Council's delay in issuing their informal proposals on time. Many stakeholders were precluded from making informed written representations due to the time constraints imposed by Bristol City Council's failure to issue their proposals on time.	2.1 2.2
		There is no statistical data to support the proposed RPS plans for Clifton Village. Despite repeated requests to Bristol City Council to see the statistical data on which the scheme has been based, no information has been forthcoming. The Council are required to provide sufficient reasons or evidence to support the implementation of the RPS.	1

		<p>As a minimum the following information should have been obtained for the Clifton Village RPS prior to the informal consultation period. Number of employees in the area, number of residents in the area, number of residential dwellings in the area, the number and size of schools, number of commuters who work in the area, modes of transport used by commuters, Residents' car ownership Business' car ownership and usage, existing number of car parking spaces including pay and display, proposed number of car parking spaces allocated by the RPS, permit and pay and display.</p>	1
		<p>The proposed allocation of additional business permits is totally inequitable. The frontage formula is totally flawed it unfairly penalizes organisations like our own with limited frontage, but benefits others such as the schools and Zoo. The number of business permits should be allocated based on the number of employees, square footage occupied of rateable value, all these methods would provide a more accurate and equitable way of allocating additional business permits.</p>	4.3
		<p>The proposals have reduced the cost of permits for charities, schools and churches. Why should these groups be treated differently to businesses, many of our employees earn lower salaries than the employees of these groups.</p>	3.2.1
		<p>We have concerns about the potential annual increases in the cost of the permits any annual increases should be capped.</p>	3.1.4
		<p>There is still limited pay and display parking around Canynge Road for visitors to our offices, despite requests for this to be addressed at the Informal Consultation stage. With the majority of the 3 to 5 hour pay and display parking being allocated to the north of Christchurch Green, demand for this parking will outstrip the number of spaces available as people look to utilise the long stay parking. There will be limited space in the vicinity of our offices for visitors. This will impact on the majority of office users in this location.</p>	3.3
		<p>The public transport services to Clifton Village are totally inadequate for the number of people working in the area. Whilst the new 505 service from Ashton Park and Ride helps to address the public transport issue for employees who live South of Bristol, it does not benefit our employees who live North, East and West of the City.</p>	4.5
		<p>There is no provision for long term parking in the Clifton Village area. West End car park is being promoted by BCC for long term parking this is not a viable option due to its distance from our office.</p>	4.6.4
		<p>All the proposed RPS areas should be phased in over a 5 year period. A phased scheme would allow improvements to public transport and for commuters to adopt differing methods of commuting to and from their workplace.</p>	4.6
		<p>The introduction of the scheme as proposed will have far reaching implications in terms of inward</p>	4.1.3

	<p>investment resulting in Clifton businesses moving out of the location due to them being unable to operate within the parameters of the scheme.</p> <p>We request that the implementation of the Clifton Village RPS is stopped after Statutory consultation period. Bristol City Council should commission surveys to collate accurate statistical data for the scheme area. A working group should be set up consisting of relevant stakeholders, the aim of will be to devise a workable RPS scheme for Clifton based on statistical data.</p>	<p>6.</p> <p>2.1 2.2 1</p>
821	<p>The proposals are confusing and over complicated. There will not be enough parking for residents or visitors.</p> <p>Permit costs are also a concern. Queries how the emissions element is calculated and whether newer, more expensive vehicles will end up with cheaper permits, which would penalise the less well off.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.1 3.2</p>
822	<p>If the scheme is aimed at reducing commuter parking then the scheme only needs to operate for two hours in the middle of the day. This would stop all day commuter parking and be less restrictive.</p> <p>What happens if there are no spaces available in the zone? There is not a nearby car park.</p> <p>The village is unique in the sense that it is a mixture of residential and commercial and the village only survives from visiting trade. When visiting becomes a hassle people will be less likely to come.</p> <p>The scheme does not need to operate on Saturdays.</p> <p>People chose to live here because of the easy access to the shops and restaurants. Why take this away.</p> <p>Why introduce pay metres in a listed conservation area? Time restrictions would work just as well but not spoilt the beauty of the area.</p> <p>Why should residents' pay to have friends and family come and visit? The free visitor's permits will end up being given to tradespeople.</p> <p>The whole scheme is about money making or else it would have been done differently.</p>	<p>3.4.4 3.4.5</p> <p>3.3.2 4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.1 4.1.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.1</p>
823	<p>The scheme will be costly and will make it difficult, if not impossible, to receive more than one visitor at the same time.</p>	<p>3.6 3.3</p>
824	<p>The proposals are detrimental to employees working in the Village. Works part-time and lives in Clevedon. Viable alternative options are very limited and would involve extra cost and extra travel time, so she will need to look for employment elsewhere.</p>	<p>4.1.3 4.4 4.3</p>

	Adequate transport links should be provided beforehand and enough permits offered to local businesses to enable parking on street.	4.5 4.3
825	There is a high level of opposition to the scheme from Bristol residents. Other sensible compromises such as a 10am-12 scheme should be considered instead.	3.4.4 3.4.5
826	The plans will damage businesses and need to be changed to help them develop and thrive. Some restrictions are needed but some areas should have longer parking stays so that people can have lunch and shop without worrying about moving their cars.	4.2 4.1.3
827	Totally support the RPS. Concerned that their voices and those of other residents might be lost amongst the opposition coming from the traders. All the residents that they know totally support the plan and for them in particular it is crucial as they have no off-street parking.	Comments noted
828	May have to stop working at Sarah Kenny if the scheme goes ahead. Paying to park is an extra cost and it will also take time to find a space. Has children so needs to be able to find a space quickly to get to work on time.  Could park in Leigh Woods but it will become extremely congested as everyone will have the same idea. What will happen when traffic backs up towards Abbots Leigh?	4.3 4.4  4.6 5.2
829	Is no longer well enough to drive and moved to Clifton Village because of the variety of shops and businesses that can be accessed on foot. Is concerned that the scheme will cause traders to fail and move away because there will be nowhere for visitors to park and their employees will be unable to get to work. If businesses fail all residents will be penalised, including those that don't own cars.	3.7 4.1.3 3.3 1.3
830	Objects to the removal of shared use parking on the north side of Gloucester Row, which is now pay & display only. There is not enough space for residents under this proposal and she will have to park farther away from home.  Objects to the scheme finishing at 9pm as visitors will have to pay or she will have to use a visitors' permit and 100 is not enough.  It would be better if it could all be shared use as now. Parking is difficult but it works. The scheme is a money making exercise.	5.8  3.4 3.6.2  1 3.1
831	A 9.00am to 9.00pm Monday to Saturday scheme is far too draconian. Even in London restrictions are in place for a maximum of 8 hours a day.  Restrictions will cause great inconvenience to his family and to visiting friends and family. The number of visitors' permits will not be sufficient.	3.4  3.6

		Bristol does not have a significant congestion problem.	1
		Bristol's public transport is the worst of any major city and is not an alternative.	4.5
		The parking scheme will not be an improvement for residents it is part of a strategy that will be imposed no matter what.	1.2
		Does not want the lines and signs to be installed as it is a conservation area.	4.1.5
832		Has off-street parking so is not personally affected by the proposal but is genuinely concerned that the plans will damage businesses and the unique charm of the Village. There is competition for parking space between residents and visitors but it is not enough of a problem to warrant the scheme.	1 3.3
		Making it difficult for people to park and limiting the maximum stay to one hour will stop people from visiting.	4.2
833		The proposed parking plan is simply wrong and should be abandoned. It is based on the idea of making as much money as possible and making it unbearable to live in Clifton Village.	1. 3.1.1
		A scheme that operates Monday to Saturday 9am until 9pm should be given proper scrutiny.	3.4
834		Identical to objection 781.	See objection 781
835		Little consideration has been given to schools, businesses, customers and clients who will be affected by the scheme. Clifton Village depends on the companies that operate there and they will be forced to close down.	1.3 2.1.3 4.1.3
		Works at Hartnell Taylor Cook and needs access to his car to conduct his job as a surveyor. This will not be possible under the proposals.	4.3 4.1.4
		Appreciates that limited permits are available but believes the numbers need to be increased. Public transport links are inappropriate as an alternative.	4.3 4.5
		Local businesses leaving the area will significantly reduce the level of income for local retailers.	4.1.3
		The proposed one hour maximum stay will limit people's ability to utilise restaurants, bars and cafes. These too will leave the area.	4.2
836		One hour parking is detrimental to businesses including hers. Customers often spend two hours in	4.2

	<p>the boutique and have lunch in the Village before or after.</p> <p>Is closing at the end of this season as the six year recession has put a strain on the business. Lack of a car park, fewer parking spaces and one hour maximum stays will cause other businesses to close.</p>	<p>4.1.3 1.3 4.2 4.6.4</p>
837	<p>Visits Clifton to shop and also has business dealings with local businesses.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay is completely unworkable for visitors. It is insufficient time to stop for coffee or browse. The time limit is also unsuitable for business meetings. It is not practical to attend these using public transport or park &amp; ride.</p> <p>Many retailers have special customer evenings, particularly around Christmas, so the extension of the restrictions until 9pm is punitive.</p> <p>Clifton Village must remain vibrant and accessible otherwise it will be full of empty premises.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2 4.5</p> <p>3.4 4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3 6.</p>
838	<p>The plans are flawed and unworkable and should be changed to protect the businesses.</p> <p>Monday to Saturday 9am to 9pm is heavy handed and excessive. A 2-3 hour restriction Monday to Friday would be sufficient to deter commuters.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay will stop visitors from coming to the Village. Operates a business in the Village and believes the scheme will have a detrimental impact on it.</p>	<p>4.1.3 1.3</p> <p>3.4 3.4.4</p> <p>4.2 4.1.3</p>
839	<p>Objects to the removal of double yellow lines on the street. Turning space is essential at each end and allowing cars on both sides will mean that cars get blocked in.</p> <p>The loss of parking spaces directly below The Paragon in the junction between York Gardens and Granby Hill is a major concern.</p>	<p>5.6</p> <p>5.18</p>
840	<p>Has moved from London to Bristol to be close to her family. Residents' parking and congestion charging work in London but Bristol is much smaller so it is not appropriate.</p> <p>Is waiting for surgery at the BRI and can only get there by taxi as she is not well enough to walk or cycle and there are no buses that go directly there.</p> <p>Plans to leave Bristol as there will be no shops and no local services, only a series of fragmented and isolated areas.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.3 6.</p>
841	<p>The plans are fundamentally flawed and disadvantage employees working in the Village. Works at Hartnell Taylor Cook and parks on street.</p>	<p>1.3 4.3</p>

		<p>Travelling from Newport by public transport is not a realistic option as it will take too long. As public transport is so inadequate there is no guarantee she would get to work on time. The distance means there are no other options.</p> <p>One hour parking will affect other businesses too as it will stop people from going for lunch in the Village which could lead to it becoming a ghost town. One business has relocated and one bank closed; this scheme will lead to more doing the same. It is a money-making scheme that will ruin livelihoods.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.2 4.1.1 4.1.3</p>
842		<p>They use the local dentist, shops and restaurants in Clifton and fear that the scheme will cause problems for customers and shopkeepers. The Council should be attracting tourists not deterring them.</p> <p>Public transport is not practical due to lack of bus infrastructure so these restrictions should not be brought in as they will have a massive impact on traders.</p>	<p>1.3 4.1.3</p> <p>4.5</p>
843		<p>The scheme is a tax on local residents and employees with little return other than covering its costs. There are no practical, reliable or cost-effective alternatives in place.</p> <p>Lives 12 miles away from his place of work and already has to park a 30 minute walk away in Clifton Village and now even that is being turned into a zone. The extra expense and inconvenience will stop people working and shopping in Bristol.</p> <p>Bristol will be car dependent until a proper alternative is introduced. Making it more difficult to use a car is not a responsible solution. A viable affordable transport system needs creating to encourage people to live and work in the city.</p>	<p>1. 3.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3 4.6 4.4</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p>
844		<p>Lives in Northcote Road which has become a car park for Clifton College and Bristol Zoo. It is often impossible for residents to move their cars, both during the day and in the evening when the College and Zoo hold events.</p> <p>The plans do not have any residents' only parking on Northcote Road so the spaces will still be used by commuters and Zoo visitors.</p> <p>Pembroke Road and part of College Road and Cecil Road is residents only but not Northcote Road which needs it more as it has no off-street parking.</p> <p>Saturdays and Sundays are the busiest days of the week where Zoo visitors are concerned, yet the scheme does not operate then. Clifton College also operates on Saturdays and often on Sundays. This has not been considered.</p> <p>Requests that some residents' only spaces be provided on Northcote Road and that the restrictions extend to the weekend.</p>	<p>Noted 3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.4 3.3.2</p>

			6
845		<p>The plans will have a detrimental impact on the Village as there will be insufficient opportunity for customers to park to collect their purchases. The prohibition of waiting on Kings Avenue will greatly inconvenience traders, deliveries and customers dropping off goods.</p> <p>The diverse small businesses are crucial to the attractive and vibrant nature of the Village. Visitors and customers do not want to struggle to get to Clifton. They will be drawn to alternatives such as Cribbs Causeway and Cabot Circus, which have better parking facilities.</p> <p>The plans need to be changed to provide sufficient parking opportunities for visitors and customers otherwise the shops and businesses will close.</p>	<p>3.3.2</p> <p>1.3 4.1</p> <p>4.3 4.1 3.3</p>
846		Identical to objection 712.	See objection 712
847		<p>There was no initial consultation and the informal consultation was cut short by one week. The Council has proceeded to implementation before consultation is complete.</p> <p>Is a nurse living in Weston-Super-Mare public transport is not reliable enough and the park &amp; rides are not open late enough.</p> <p>The majority of residents object to the scheme as well and are not being listened to.</p> <p>The Council will be responsible for businesses closing and the consequences that will have for individuals, families and the wider community.</p> <p>The Council should do something about the number of students bring their cars for the whole term and do not move them. The will probably be allocated permits because their families can afford them.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.5 3.7</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.1.3 6.</p> <p>3.5</p>
848		<p>Shoppers will be deterred from parking in the Village, thus harming local businesses. These shoppers will travel out of town instead, increasing the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Parking capacity has been severely reduced so there will not be enough room for all residents to park legally. Too many spaces have been replaced with double yellow lines.</p> <p>Residents will be financially penalised and will gain no benefit.</p> <p>The scheme is flawed and unworkable.</p>	<p>1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>1.2 3.1.1</p> <p>Noted</p>
849		Objects to the scheme because it has not been discussed fully with the traders of Clifton Village and it will adversely affect businesses. Significant change is required before the scheme will work.	2.1.3



850		<p>Has just moved to the Village due to the unique nature of the area with its coffee shops, gift shops and small businesses.</p> <p>Significant change is needed to enable visitors to continue to come to Clifton. Her customers have said that they would not come if they could not park for longer than an hour or two. This will lead to a decline in places to visit as businesses cease trading and this will damage the whole area.</p> <p>Customers come to Clifton by car as it is easier to travel with young children. The small 8 and 9 buses are not viable for them. Cycling is not either. There should be a dedicated park &amp; ride for Clifton.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2 1.3</p> <p>4.5 1.3</p>
851		<p>The scheme will destroy the Village. Currently drives her daughter to Clifton High School then stays in the Village for a few hours to go to dance class and visit the local shops.</p> <p>If the scheme is introduced she will have to go elsewhere as the additional costs are too great. The scheme is unnecessary and unwanted.</p>	<p>4.1.3 1.3</p> <p>1 3.1</p>
852		<p>There are 8 fewer parking spaces for permit holders in the immediate vicinity when every space is needed. Many spaces in the whole area will be covered by double yellow lines.</p> <p>Teachers at local schools will be unable to park. If numerous permits are issued to them this will make the residents' parking problems worse.</p> <p>The scheme is confusing to visitors with its different operating hours and will be detrimental to restaurants with its Monday to Saturday 9.00am to 9.00pm restrictions. It should be Monday to Friday 9.00am to 6.00pm throughout the area. This will deter commuters and enable restaurants to trade.</p> <p>There should have been an initial consultation to enable concerns to be addressed.</p>	<p>1.2 6</p> <p>4.3 4.4</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
853		<p>Owns a hair and beauty salon in the Village and has clients who treatments take 2-4 hours. These clients also use shops and businesses or have lunch. This contributes to the income of the other businesses. The businesses are all dependent on each other for encouraging visitors and generating trade. Businesses will close and the life will go out of the Village.</p> <p>There are too many multi occupancy properties in Clifton. Residents might think they will be able to park easily when the scheme comes in but that will never be the case. He and his clients have never been completely unable to park.</p> <p>The scheme should not go ahead. As a minimum the one hour stay should increase to four hours.</p>	<p>4.2. 4.1.3 6</p> <p>3.3 3.5 1.3</p> <p>4.2</p>
854		<p>Charging until 9pm will not help traders, restaurants or residents. Charging in the city centre ends at 6pm.</p>	<p>3.4</p>

	<p>One hour is not long enough to visit a restaurant.</p> <p>The offices will be affected as their staff and visitors will not be able to have permits. The scheme will force businesses to close which will affect the Village.</p> <p>Parking is proposed on both sides of Manilla Road. It is very narrow and refuse vehicles and fire engines cannot easily get through. Vehicles currently park on the pavement which restricts it for pedestrians. The previous plan had parking on one side of the road only. This should be reconsidered and parking restricted to the Manilla lodge side of the road only rather than the Tower House side as previously proposed.</p> <p>The scheme will involve street furniture which will destroy the character of the conservation area. The old cast iron lamp posts are already ruined with 20mph signs. Parking restriction signs, parking bays, double yellow lines and meters will make this much worse.</p> <p>The scheme is a tax that brings no benefit to residents.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that it will deter commuters. There are generally no parking problems during the summer and other university holidays. The University should take action and then this scheme will not be needed. If city centre commuters are the problem then city centre parking should be free so that they park close to where they work.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4 4.1.3</p> <p>5.18 6</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>1.2 3.1.1</p> <p>1</p>
856	<p>In Canynge Road just south of the cross roads with Percival Road, it is proposed to have a small area of permit parking at the back of Numbers 34 and 35 Canynge Square. The parking here is not ideal for the traffic flow and access for emergency vehicles. Cars sometimes block our rear gate in this location.</p> <p>Visitors to the village will park in the north to avoid later restrictions in the south. The areas around Christchurch Green should have the same restrictions as the north to allow more freedom to visitors of the south. This would help the businesses.</p> <p>The five hour pay &amp; display on the north of Canynge Road is for the zoo. The zoo should provide sufficient parking for its guests. The parking on the streets should be for permit holders' only.</p>	<p>5.18</p> <p>3.4 4.1.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
857	<p>The proposed parking scheme is mad! Why change what works well for the community?</p> <p>The parking is bad enough, but to add further restrictions will adversely affect so many people and the consequences are unknown.</p> <p>One hour parking will have an adverse effect on people who rely on driving to visit the shops and cafes in the village.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.2</p>

		What about tradesmen?	3.9
		The whole idea is anti-social and being used to raise revenue.	1 3.1.1
858		<p>The scheme should not proceed as residents do not support it.</p> <p>It will penalise people who have already paid extra to live in Clifton.</p> <p>It will kill of shops by discouraging shopping by limiting the time people can spend there.</p> <p>Other businesses will move away as their employees will be unable to get to work.</p> <p>It will restrict the number of visitors that residents can have, the number of cars their family can have and their freedom of movement.</p> <p>If it were really intended to deter commuters then a 2 hour scheme would suffice. There is no benefit from charging until 9pm.</p>	1.2 2.1 2.2  1.2  4.1.1 4.1.3  4.3 4.6  3.6  3.4.4 3.4.5
859		<p>The proposals do not represent the residents' wishes and it is not democratic to push them through.</p> <p>They would have a huge negative impact on residents, businesses, visitors and families and will bring no benefits. Transport should be made easier, not more difficult and expensive.</p>	1 2.1 2.2  1.2 1.3 4.5
860		Enjoys visiting family and friends in Bristol and spending time in the Village. One hour is not long enough to shop there, let alone to have coffee or lunch as well. They need to drive to Clifton as their family live in Frampton Cotterell and Bedminster and do not have public transport links. They will no longer come to the Village if they cannot park.	1. 4.2 3.6
861		The plans are flawed and not fit for purpose.	Noted

	<p>There is no car park within walking distance of Litfield House. Paid parking for 2-3 hours is not enough time for most patients and is costly for staff and patients. No thought has been given to providing metered parking for patients or permits for staff.</p> <p>Residents are aware of parking problems in Clifton before they move there. This is an exceptional area as it contains many businesses and the negative impact on them has been underestimated. Carries heavy equipment to work and needs to drive.</p> <p>Patients that are well enough go into Clifton for lunch or shopping and will no longer do some with parking charges.</p> <p>The scheme puts her job in jeopardy as well as the viability of the business that she works for.</p>	<p>4.2 4.3 4.4 4.6</p> <p>1. 4.3 4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
862	<p>Little consideration has been given to schools, businesses, customers and clients that will be affected. Clifton Village depends on its businesses and they will be forced to close.</p> <p>The nature of their business means that they must have their cars to attend properties and sites, therefore they need permits. The number offered is not sufficient for them. Many colleagues also rely on their cars to pick up and drop off their children before/after the working day. Many of them are considering seeking alternative employment.</p> <p>Many local businesses will leave the area which will reduce income for retail businesses. The one hour parking limit will also prevent people from using the facilities in the Village and will cause businesses to leave.</p>	<p>2.1.3</p> <p>4.3 4.4 4.6 4.1.3</p> <p>4.2</p>
863	<p>Regularly shops, eats out and visits the hairdressers in Clifton. They visit at least once a week with most visits lasting longer than an hour.</p> <p>Due to their age and mobility they would be unable to park further away and would also feel vulnerable returning to their car in the evening. The scheme will have a profound effect on their social life and shopping and will deprive the businesses of their financial support. They will probably go elsewhere as will many other older people. This needs to be fully considered.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p>
864	<p>Drives to work, dropping off her children on the way. Will be unable to park in the Village if the scheme comes in.</p> <p>Public transport is not a viable alternative as it would take too long and cost an additional £31 a month (£66 rather than £35). Cycling is also not practical due to the cost of buying and maintaining a bike. The only option will be to park on the Downs which may not be safe.</p>	<p>4.3 4.4</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p>
865	The plans are flawed and not fit for purpose. They require significant change and the progress of the scheme should be halted until these matters have been addressed.	Noted
866	Will have nowhere to park if the scheme comes in.	4.3 4.4

	Works at RDF Television which employs 30 people, the majority of whom drive to work. They hire many cars for work so will not be able to use permits as the cars all have different registration numbers.	4.6.4 4.1 4.3
867	Identical to objection 865.	See objection 865
868	Identical to objection 865.  Adds that public transport is not sufficient and that more cycle parking should be introduced.	See objection 865  4.5
869	The plans are not fit for purpose and significant change is required. Insufficient consideration has been given to the views of local residents and traders. It has been rushed through despite massive opposition. It will damage business and the free movement of people.	2.1 2.2 4.1.3
870	Urges the Council to press on with the scheme as proposed as it is needed urgently.	Comments noted
871	The plan is fundamentally flawed and not designed around the needs of the Village. Clifton thrives on tourists and visitors as well as its own community. One hour parking will have a detrimental effect on businesses and the general ambience of the Village.  Does not currently have a parking problem. If the scheme is imposed it should not include Saturday and should only be for 2-3 hours during the working day.  Signs, lines and machines are not in keeping with the conservation area.	4.2  3.4  4.1.5
872	Is a multiple retailer in the Village and needs her customers to be able to park for long enough to go shopping, stop for coffee etc. the plans need a fundamental change. They are not workable for traders or for residents who will suffer from the restrictions extending until 9pm.	4.2 3.4 1.3
873	Lives in Weston-Super-Mare and works at Bristol Zoo. Has used local buses to get to work but it is	4.3

		inefficient and irregular and makes the working day too long. It then became impossible once he was asked to work Sundays. This makes driving essential. The scheme will cripple the Zoo as a positive conservation force.	4.5 4.6 4.6.4
874		<p>Identical to objection 871.</p> <p>Monday to Saturday 9am until 9pm is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>There will be a loss of spaces creating a parking problem which previously did not exist.</p> <p>Clifton Village is a destination shopping area and the restrictions will deter people from visiting which will seriously affect the small businesses.</p>	<p>See objection 871</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>6</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3 6</p>
875		<p>Objects to the introduction of paid parking on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. Have three young children, concerned that they will not be able to park anywhere on their road. Has lived in London before so does not necessarily object to the idea of a parking scheme.</p> <p>Urges for this to be reconsidered and at least made shared parking.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p>
876		<p>Wholeheartedly objects to the proposals because it will damage tourism and already struggling local businesses.</p> <p>The costs of permits are too high and this is unfair on already struggling families trying to make ends meet. This is a tax on the poor.</p> <p>Already struggles to find a parking space, why should we have to pay to fight to find a space?</p> <p>No free parking to visitors unless they park a long way away. Elderly relatives will have to walk a lengthy distance after a long drive. This will put our friends and family off coming.</p> <p>It will spoil Bristol's finest beauty spot.</p>	<p>1.3 4.1.3</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>3.6 1,2</p> <p>1 6</p>
877		<p>The restrictions will make it more difficult to park, reducing visitors and damaging business. The amount of traffic circulating will increase.</p> <p>It will cause unsightly road markings and street furniture.</p> <p>Walking and cycling is not viable for all journeys.</p>	<p>1.3 4.1.1 4.1.3 4.1.5</p> <p>4.3 4.5</p>

		Public transport is inadequate and unreliable.	4.5
		Currently parking is not perfect but is far preferable to these plans, both for individual residents and the community as a whole as it will cause businesses to fail.	1 4.1.3 6
878		Residents will have to pay for permits and pay again to park in other RPS areas. This is a stealth tax.	1.2 3.1
		Local businesses will be affected by access issues as local parking is restricted and expensive. There seem to be more areas for paid parking than for residents. People may seek employment elsewhere, increasing the number of car journeys.	3.3 1
		The scheme should not operate on Saturdays or until 9.00pm as commuters are not working then.	3.4
		Existing RPS areas do not help residents as they are daytime only so it is still busy in the evening. Commuters are shifted onto the nearest unrestricted street. This scheme will move them to the Downs or beyond, leading to more schemes.	1.3 1.4 5.2
		Other cities that have residents' parking have efficient and cheap public transport, unlike in Bristol.	1 4.5
		The plans are not fit for purpose and need significant change.	Noted
		There is no direct public transport option that takes less than an hour which is much longer than it takes to drive.	4.5 4.6
		Business rate receipts will go down as businesses move away and Bristol will decline.	4.1.3 6
879		Owens SoleLution on Boyces Avenue and regularly visits the area with family and friends.	Noted
		Employs people from all over the Bristol area and will need a permit for each one. The draft Order states that the number of permits issued is at the discretion of the Council. If she is unable to purchase a permit for each staff member, they must use public transport, which is poor and expensive as well as taking too long. The new service from Long Ashton will not work for those travelling from the other side of the city. This will also add time and expense to their journeys. If staff leave she would need to invest time and effort in finding replacements.	4.3 4.5 4.1.3 4.6
		Many customers travel by car. It takes around 20 minutes to fit a child with shoes, which does not	4.2

		<p>include any waiting time or travel time to and from the shop.</p> <p>Concerned the business is not going to get enough permits as it says in the order that this is at the discretion of the council.</p> <p>Public transport is not good enough. Even though there is a new park and ride service, it is not suitable for staff. They will have to travel across town to get to it causing more congestion in the Cumberland Basin. It will add significantly to their journey times.</p> <p>One hour parking is not enough for residents.</p> <p>Customers won't want to park near the zoo for a longer trip to the village because the walk will add another half an hour to their journeys.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.6.4 4.2</p>
880		<p>Many older people and young families come to Clifton to spend a few hours looking round. The reduction in parking places available to them means they will go elsewhere. They will not cycle to Clifton and public transport is not good enough.</p> <p>Works in Kingsdown and sees people trying to park every day when there are lots of empty spaces for residents. Believes that the approach of removing commuters from the city centre is wrong as we want people to work in Bristol. People park in Clifton then walk to work for 12 hour shifts, walking back afterwards. The park &amp; rides are too few, close too early and buses are too infrequent.</p> <p>120 visitors' permits will not be enough to cater for weekly bible study groups or regular Saturday lunches etc. She has a cleaner but won't be able to give her passes so will have to do without.</p> <p>Restricted parking until 5pm each day would be acceptable, with all areas mixed resident and pay &amp; display and for three hours. A better solution needs to be found for commuters, many of whom are low paid working long shifts.</p>	<p>4.3 4.5 4.6.4</p> <p>1 4.5 4.3</p> <p>3.6.2</p> <p>3.4 3.3 4.2</p>
881		<p>Runs two long-established retail outlets in the Village and believes that one hour parking is not sufficient for their customers, many of whom come from further afield. Another solution is needed that benefits residents and businesses.</p>	<p>4.2 4.1.3</p>
882		<p>The scheme is not fit for purpose and significant changes are needed. The one hour parking will significantly affect trade resulting in fewer customers. Both customers and staff will be deterred from the Village due to poor transport links.</p> <p>There was no significant early consultation with residents in and around Clifton.</p>	<p>4.2 4.5 4.1.3</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
883		<p>Totally supports the scheme.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
884		<p>Is a parent at Clifton Children's House. It is currently dangerous to pick up her child as she often has to park in the middle of the road. She would like there to be an allocated space for 15 minutes to</p>	<p>5.16</p>



	<p>provide for this and believes that if the scheme goes ahead people will use this space to go shopping and there will be nowhere to drop off or pick up.</p> <p>Clifton Village is a relaxing place to stroll around and enjoy lunch and shopping. This will be lost if the scheme comes in. The timings should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>3.4 4.2 1.3</p>
885	<p>The plans are fundamentally flawed as they do not provide adequate parking provision for their staff members, consultants operating from the premises, consultants travelling from other cities by car, the new surgical suite, patients of the Integrated cancer Support Specialist, the periodontics and the surgery's numerous patients.</p>	<p>4.3 3.7 4.6.4</p>
886	<p>The scheme will not work for residents or workers in the area. If it is intended to prevent commuter parking then limited periods of two or three hours during the day would do this, leaving plenty of space for shoppers and visitors. 9-9 including Saturdays will have a disastrous effect on business. Their house is a small B&amp;B. They will not be able to manage if there is only three hour parking nearby. They are already losing bookings because of this.</p> <p>The reduction in available space and the lack of a new off-street car park means there will be more competition for spaces. They need their own transport as public transport is unreliable.</p>	<p>3.4 4.1.3 6. 4.3</p> <p>3.3 4.5</p>
887	<p>The double yellow lines on The Paragon should not be removed.</p> <p>There is not enough parking for one car per household and they are regularly competing for space with builders etc. Removing the double yellow lines will create chaos.</p> <p>They are on the boundary with Cliftonwood &amp; Hotwells RPS but will no longer be able to park on Granby Hill and will have to compete for space in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>5.6</p> <p>1. 3.3</p> <p>5.2</p>
888	<p>The proposals are not in the best interests of the public. He commutes to Bristol to work every day and feels there is no reasonable provision for commuters. People who work in between school runs have no time to catch public transport. Public transport is poor and expensive. If the Council takes an amenity away from people it should provide a better alternative.</p>	<p>1. 4.6.4 4.5 4.6</p>
889	<p>They are not happy with the lack of time locals and businesses have been given to raise any objections.</p> <p>They have a relatively new business and they feel the current one hour parking limit will severely reduce the number of visits to Clifton Arcade which will have an impact on their business. Currently struggling, new parking restrictions may put them out of business.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.2 4.1.3 6. 1.3</p>
890	<p>They object to the scheme as it is not workable in its current state as the revised plans are flawed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>Scheme should not operate on Saturday and the hours of operation should be 9am – 5pm.</p> <p>The local shops, restaurants and other small businesses will be adversely affected by these restrictive operating hours. Feels Clifton Village is being treated differently from the rest of Bristol.</p> <p>Feels it is unnecessary and confusing to have parking bays with different time limits. Maximum stay of 3 hours would be reasonable.</p> <p>Permit holder bays on the eastern side of Grange Rd south of the junction with Manilla Rd have been removed. The only people who could be affected are those entering or leaving the Rodney Lodge development. As a long standing member of the owners committee they can assure us that no owner or resident has ever raised this matter</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>5.18</p>
891		<p>Not against the scheme in principle but have concerns about the proposal.</p> <p>Feels the plans are not fit for purpose and require more thought and alteration if RPS is to work successfully. Needs further consultation.</p> <p>Concerns for local shops and other businesses.</p> <p>The RPS should not run until 9pm or on a Saturday.</p> <p>Too many spaces have been removed, for e.g. at 8-11 Royal Park.</p> <p>Introducing a major scheme without asking people if they want it is wrong in a democracy.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>6</p> <p>1</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>
892		<p>The impact the RPS can have on local shops and businesses regarding the additional costs and restrictions could be disastrous.</p> <p>A 'lighter touch' would be far more acceptable</p> <p>Feels the 9pm end is ridiculous and grossly unfair without additional evening visitor permits.</p> <p>Saturday restrictions are not needed in most streets.</p> <p>The reasoning given for the justification for turning single yellow lines introduced to provide safer routes to school for e.g. Kensington Place &amp; Royal Park into double yellow lines.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.6.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>6</p>

		<p>Statement of reasons gives no justification for removing parking spaces outside no. 8-11 Royal Park.</p> <p>Many other spaces have been removed for what seems like no reason and little thought has been made given to creating new ones.</p> <p>The order allows the council undue discretion to issue permits where there is sufficient space. This needs to be clearly defined.</p> <p>No provisions in the scheme for tourists/day visitors.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.6.4</p>
893		<p>They believe that the planned scheme is not fit for purpose and requires significant changes to ensure that it is viable and deliverable for the area.</p> <p>Our Clifton Village based office has 55 employees over 3 floors. Half the staff are office based the other half will be out visiting clients. They have 9 designated off road car park spaces. 6 are for staff, 3 for visitors.</p> <p>RPS threatens our ability to attract and retain staff in an extremely competitive recruitment market.</p> <p>The proposed scheme does not provide sufficient parking for people commuting into the area for the day. Nearest paid parking is 20 minutes' walk away. Paying for 5 hours parking is not practical for employees that work 7.5 day.</p> <p>Seven permits will not be sufficient to meet the parking requirements of our staff. The new provisions do not give them any comfort that they will be able to obtain more permits. If there are enough permits they would need to be transferrable between all staff cars.</p> <p>Extending the Long Ashton Park &amp; Ride into Clifton (albeit useful for some commuters) opposed to introducing a specific service will lead to an additional commuting time for those staff. There are no provisions for Park &amp; Ride for commuters going into Clifton from North, West or East of the city. This is not a viable long term option using Park &amp; Ride into the City Centre and then walk/catch another bus into Clifton. This will make working for Mazars unattractive.</p> <p>RPS has a knock on effect for the economy of Clifton Village through the patronage of local retailers, cafes, restaurants and pubs.</p> <p>The staff of Mazars are their key asset and as a result of RPS they will be forced to relocate our business and end their long association (27 years) with the area.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>6</p>

		The consultation process has been inadequate.	2.1 2.2
894		<p>They feel RPS will hinder the vibrancy of the area.</p> <p>An hour is not enough time to enjoy what Clifton has to offer. People will stop visiting.</p> <p>More attention needs to be given to the public transport in the city, which is overpriced and sparse.</p> <p>Parking is an issue on their road but they can always find a space.</p>	1  4.2 4.5 1.2.2
895		<p>They object to the scheme as they state that they would not be guaranteed a parking space even if they buy a permit.</p> <p>The signs, meters, yellow lines etc will have a detrimental effect on the beautiful Georgian architecture of the Village.</p> <p>They object to the scheme running to 9pm and not getting any extra visitors permits.</p> <p>The scheme seems like another way for the council to make money.</p>	3.3.1  4.1.5  3.4 3.6  1 3.1.1
896		<p>Believe their road is operative Mon – Sat, 9am – 9pm while other parts of CV is Mon – Fri, 9am – 5pm. They see no logic as to why their road is being treated differently.</p> <p>RPS will have a huge impact on this family practically and financially. While their neighbours on adjoining streets will be able to park outside traditional business hours, and have visitors on Saturdays.</p>	3.4  3.4 3.6
897		<p>Believe their road is operative Mon – Sat, 9am – 9pm while other parts of CV is Mon – Fri, 9am – 5pm, yet they still get no extra visitor permits.</p> <p>If their elderly parents wish to visit on a Saturday, they will have a problem and will have to park in the NCP car park.</p> <p>If the scheme is to go ahead, they request that Richmond Hill is Mon – Fri, 9am – 5pm like other areas of Clifton.</p>	3.4 3.6.2  3.6  3.4
898		<p>The current parking for these individuals is more than manageable. When we return from work there is always parking available.</p> <p>RPS will drastically reduce the number of spaces due to increased double yellows. Resulting in paying for a vastly reduced level of parking.</p>	1.2.2  3.3

		<p>RPS will affect local commerce in the village. For example their partners hairdresser. Clients arrive via their cars and an average hair appointment is longer than an hour. This is just one e.g. of a long list as to why stringent public parking would adversely affect the village.</p> <p>They feel that they will be paying the council more money to make the parking situation even worse.</p> <p>Suggestions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paint parking spaces in the current diagonal arrangement along the crescent to minimise the amount of wasted space.</li> <li>• Paint spaces along the garage frontage to stop the blocking of garage entrances. But, not reducing the amount of space currently available.</li> </ul>	<p>4.2 1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>1 3.1.1</p> <p>6</p>
899		<p>They do not object to RPS but to the extent of restrictions associated with RPS.</p> <p>They feel 9am – 9pm, Mon – Sat is unnecessary. Will lead to parking problems after work, particularly at the end of the working day. Demand for parking will be high and residents with permits will be forced to use the pay machines.</p> <p>Excessive double yellow lines will take away valuable parking spaces for residents.</p> <p>They feel the scheme has little to do with preventing commuter parking. As BCC could have restricted parking for 1 or 2 chosen hours in the working day.</p> <p>Feel the council has failed to listen to the inhabitants for whose benefit these schemes are allegedly being put in place.</p> <p>Businesses in Clifton Village will suffer as a result of the short term parking allowed.</p> <p>Feels the council has not listened and feel this is a revenue making scheme.</p> <p>Believes these schemes impose a tax on the movement of vehicles across the city. They should focus on making the city more attractive to visitors and investors.</p> <p>The DYL's in The Paragon should be removed altogether. Feel that this will cause chaos in a road which is barely 2 vehicles wide. The DYL's as currently laid down should be retained without alteration.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.3 6 3.4.4 3.4.5</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>2.1 2.2 3.1.1</p> <p>1 4.5</p> <p>5.6</p>
900		<p>Feel the current proposals need a fundamental change, as the scheme is not fit for purpose and significant change is required before it will work.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		1 hour parking limit will result in loss of trade as there is inadequate transport links to Clifton. RPS threatens the economic viability of the village.	4.2 1.3 4.1.3
901		<p>Feel that Christchurch Green should be incorporated in the North of Clifton Park. An earlier cut off time would be better as visitors to the village begin to arrive from 6pm onwards.</p> <p>To encourage people to visit the village but avoid parking in residential areas, there is no reason why parking should not be free after 5pm and on Saturday in the Christchurch Green spaces, denoted by purple colouring.</p> <p>7pm cut off time in the south area would be more appropriate.</p> <p>The 1 hour limit in the central village will be damaging to businesses.</p> <p>Is it true that there will be parking within walking reach offering longer times? But the spaces in these areas will, in their view, prove to be quite insufficient.</p> <p>Parking charges will be a disincentive; potentially shoppers traveling by car will go elsewhere.</p> <p>9pm finish is too late. In addition to the parking charges this will damage evening trade in the village for pubs, restaurants, bars etc. Will also encourage visitors to park in other areas if the cut off time is 5pm. Creating an evening problem.</p>	3.4 5.2  3.4  3.4 4.2 3.4  4.1.1 4.1.3 1.3  3.4 6
902		<p>Introduction of RPS will destroy the buzzing atmosphere, diverse business and tourist opportunities within the village.</p> <p>They object to the cost for the privilege to park outside their home.</p> <p>The number of permits eligible for residents is too strict, especially for shared occupancy. What if they are young professionals requiring a car to get to work where public transport does not meet their needs.</p> <p>They do not understand why this scheme has to run until 9pm and include Saturdays, when other areas are operative until 5pm.</p> <p>Concerned I will not be able to have friends or family to visit easily from outside the city.</p> <p>The RPS may force me to move out of the area.</p>	4.1.3 1.3  1. 3.1  3.3 3.5 4.5  3.4  3.6  1.2
903		They are a shop owner in the village for 40 years. The current plans are not workable and will need	1.3

	<p>considerable changes before it can be implemented without causing severe trading problems to several businesses in the area.</p> <p>The proposed 1 hour parking limits, limited permits making day to day work practices of many businesses difficult, and very poor public transport is of most immediate concern.</p> <p>They feel the scheme has been fast tracked and is overriding the concerns of residents and businesses.</p>	<p>4.2 4.5</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
904	<p>They work in Bristol Zoo and they coordinate volunteers as part of their job. The RPS would have a direct impact on the volunteers which may result in them dropping certain aspects of the zoo which helps them raise money for conservation.</p> <p>If their volunteers cannot park or have to pay to park, they will lose a number of them and have to think about closing the volunteer scheme which will also cause unemployment.</p> <p>RPS could potentially affect their guest experience at the zoo, which raises money for the conservation.</p> <p>RPS could potentially mean that we would need to re-house some animals used in the Animal Encounter as this is run by volunteers.</p> <p>They feel they would not be able to offer outreach to schools, adult community groups and other fairs and fetes in the surrounding area as we would not be able to park the zoo vehicle. As these sessions are run by volunteers, which raises money for conservation.</p>	<p>1.1 1.3</p> <p>4.3 4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.3 4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.3</p>
905	<p>They are not happy with the change of shared parking on the north side of Suspension Bridge which was shared use, and now pay and display only. This is retrograde for the residents in Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings.</p> <p>The six permit spaces on the south side of Suspension Bridge are likely to be used throughout the day by non-residential permit holders, from a firm of accountants, large pub and shops in the Mall. Residents will have nowhere to park. The solution would be to reinstate the shared use on the north side.</p> <p>The extension of the pay and display hours will encourage visitors for the evening trade to arrive later to avoid the meter charge. Resulting in later departure therefore later night noise, increasing the nuisance.</p> <p>Pay and display should be discontinued at 6pm.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>5.8</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.4</p>
906	<p>Limited parking areas and times will discourage people from coming to the village for lunch to do their shopping as they won't have time, severely affecting the business.</p>	<p>4.2 4,1.3</p>

		<p>Parking restrictions will affect tourism. People coming to look at the bridge, the downs, the observatory and the zoo. Often staying for a meal after.</p> <p>The 9am – 9pm operational times will stop residents having friends pop over for dinner and will restrict the numbers that go to the village for dinner too.</p> <p>Suggestions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make less restrictions in the village with more areas of 2 plus hours parking</li> <li>• Car park needed if we intend to limit parking in the centre of the village. So tourists &amp; visitors continue going to the village</li> <li>• The scheme should run 9am-6pm</li> </ul>	<p>1.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>3.4</p>
907		<p>Feel RPS will have a detrimental effect on the unique character of the area by making it difficult for anyone visiting the businesses, shops and restaurants.</p> <p>The public transport is woeful. If BCC expect people to leave their cars and adequate alternative is needed.</p> <p>Why are people with a drive only allowed one permit, while those without are allowed three. They feel this is grossly unfair.</p> <p>They feel that it would make more sense and be cost effective to not put double yellow lines down in the first place on the proposals.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.5.1</p> <p>5.18</p>
908		<p>They are against the proposed parking scheme. They do recognise that there is a parking situation, which is not ideal, but it is free and you can always find a space.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to ask for a visitor permit that restricts the amount of visits I can have to their own house.</p> <p>These parking restrictions will make current residents want to move out of Clifton and will deter new residents from moving in.</p> <p>A downturn in visitors to the Village will have a knock on effect for local businesses and the profit they make.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>6.</p>
909		<p>They object to the inadequate number of business permits given to small business rates businesses. They have 18 members of staff which some work unsociable hours when public transport does not operate. 10 staff works 8.30am – 10pm every workday. Some staff can work up until 2am when a function is taking place.</p> <p>Their business relies heavily on lunch and function trade. With the 1 hour restriction directly outside</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.2</p>



		<p>elderly members will have to park further away if they can get a space. There will be strict time limits for them to have lunch and socialise, which is a key factor of our membership.</p> <p>They have members that live outside the city who rely on their cars as transport links are not sufficient.</p> <p>The Mall has residential and commercial tenants, increasing costs for business permits can create issues with clients being able to park for meetings, and they may possibly leave the village.</p> <p>With Cliftonwood live, displaced parking threatens Clifton Village. If Clifton Village goes live the same domino effect will apply to Redland and Leigh Woods.</p> <p>The scheme needs tweaking to work for business and residents alike.</p> <p>They feel their business will suffer financially and their membership that they worked hard to maintain will decrease.</p>	<p>4.3 4.6.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p>
910		<p>Feel that permit parking will have an adverse effect on the vibe and culture of Clifton Village.</p> <p>How will local businesses expect employees to be able to get to work with limited numbers of permits for their business and no all-day parking available.</p> <p>They would be open to public transport if it was cheaper, user friendly, better timed. The job they do requires them to be flexible and public transport does not accommodate this.</p> <p>They carry heavy bags for work. Walking for long periods of time (20 mins to Clifton Down train station – Clifton Village) would not be good for my health.</p> <p>They feel taking away the ability for employees to perform their job is unfair and will just drive business and people away from the area.</p> <p>Local offices give the shops, cafes and pubs good regular client base, and would struggle if the businesses are driven away.</p>	<p>1.2 1.3</p> <p>4.3 4.6.4 4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6 4.3</p> <p>4.1.3 4.3</p> <p>4.1.3 1.3</p>
911		<p>Feel that the current plans are not fit for purpose and significant change is required before they will work.</p> <p>Feels that the 1 hour parking is ridiculous as it will not give customers anytime to come to the village</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2</p>

		<p>to shop, have lunch, go to the dentist, have their hair done etc.</p> <p>As they are a retailer they feel this will have a detrimental impact to their business.</p> <p>Suggestions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All paid parking bays should be allowed up to 3 hours</li> <li>• The restrictions should be lessened after 6pm. Have parking up to midnight at a reduced charge.</li> </ul>	<p>4.1.3 1.3</p> <p>4.2 3.4</p>
912		<p>Accountants based in Clifton Village for over 35 years.</p> <p>They object to the number of permits available. Their staff comes in to work from various areas within and outside Bristol. Members of staff need their car for client visits.</p> <p>Clients visit their offices regularly. A 1 hour parking limit will not be sufficient. This could deter our clients resulting in them looking elsewhere for accountancy services.</p> <p>Feel retaining and attracting staff will be a real issue if the staff have little or no practical alternative to driving.</p> <p>No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the RPS will improve traffic in the area.</p> <p>They feel that commercial businesses employing large numbers will be forced to relocate. Having a knock on effect on retail business.</p> <p>Their understanding is that the RPS was fast tracked and the consultation phase was missed.</p> <p>They feel it is not acceptable for Mayor Ferguson and BCC to make fundamental decisions with no evidence to support their plans. Particularly when those decisions would undoubtedly affect the livelihoods of so many.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3 4.5 4.6 1</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>1 2.1 2.2</p>
913		<p>They are a resident and shopper in Clifton Village and they object to the scheme as it will kill the spirit of the village.</p>	<p>1.2 1.3</p>
914		<p>They work for a consultant at Litfield House and are concerned that the 2/3 hours maximum stay will greatly affect him being able to continue there.</p> <p>Clients can have 2-3 hour appointments and need to be able to stay longer. 5 hours stay would be some consolation.</p> <p>They feel there is a strong possibility Litfield House will not survive if meters are installed and you cannot stay for up to 7 hours. Patients depend on Litfield House for cancer treatment/care.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.2 4.6.4</p>

			4.3
915		They feel that if the parking restrictions are applied, the clinic (Litfield House) will become limited in its use then they will have to find alternative premises in the Bristol area.	4.1.3
916		<p>Clifton is a thriving, friendly and supportive neighbourhood and the parking restrictions will spoil this on so many levels.</p> <p>How are they, as residents supposed to deal with friends, relatives, workmen, carers etc. coming to visit?</p> <p>How will the small independent shops, bars and restaurants supposed to attract any customers when they cannot find a space to park as it has been drastically reduced. When they do find a space they are limited to 1 hour.</p> <p>They feel the cost of the permit and the operation time seems grossly unfair. This will be no benefit.</p> <p>Suggestions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit or ban students from bringing their cars into Bristol</li> <li>• Allow free parking in the residential streets but ensure that only those with residents parking permits can park between 2pm – 3pm.</li> </ul>	<p>1.2 1.3</p> <p>3.6 3.7 3.9</p> <p>4.2 1.3 3.3</p> <p>3.1 3.4</p> <p>3.5 3.4.4</p>
917		<p>Their argument is why pay £50 to get the exact same level of service as they do now, which is no guarantee of parking.</p> <p>They feel the first permit should be free.</p> <p>Feel P&amp;D will increase traffic in the area as people now expect to find spaces available.</p>	<p>3.3.1 3.1</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.3.2</p>
918		<p>Local business renting out property: From what they understand of RPS, contractors will be very hard hit and excluded from areas. Their business will have to purchase very expensive permits for their staff to enable them to carry out their job.</p> <p>The number of permits that they can apply for is limited.</p> <p>They are landlords but not to the scale you have in your proposals and the current scheme will bar them from being able to work on their properties.</p> <p>They feel RPS will make their job as a letting agent impossible under the proposals and will inevitably lead to our decline and closure.</p>	<p>3.9</p> <p>3.9</p> <p>1.3 3.9</p> <p>4.1.3 4.1.4</p>

		A contractor pass with no costs associated with this and not allocated to a particular vehicle would allow us to pass from contractor to contractor as is needed.	3.9
919	t	<p>They object to the scheme as it will endanger their Bed &amp; Breakfast business as there will be nowhere for the customers to park.</p> <p>Residents' of Princes' Buildings, Wellington Terrace and the bottom part of Sion Hill will have a dramatic reduction in the opportunity to park due to the proposed introduction of 30 pay and display only bays out of a total of 75 currently available parking places. There are 69 properties in this location from the Rocks Railway leading down to Wellington Terrace, and Prince' Buildings. If all 69 properties have a vehicle, there will be 69 cars trying to secure parking from 45 permit bays, a shortfall of 24 residents without parking.</p> <p>The chances of residents finding a space within the Princes' Buildings area after work are slim. With the loss of 30/40 parking places from Royal York Crescent and the overflow from The Paragon &amp; Princess Victoria Street.</p> <p>They argue why should residents who are unable to find a space in their area have to pay for a pay and display bay.</p> <p>Princess Buildings is a grade 2 listed as are other buildings in the area. They consider the current meter's design is not keeping with the conservation area. A telephone payment system would be beneficial.</p> <p>They object to the timings of the proposed scheme 9am – 9pm and 6 days a week.</p>	<p>4.3 4.3.4 4.2</p> <p>3.3 3.5</p> <p>3.3 3.5</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.4</p>
920		<p>They object to the lack of consultation. Cards were supposed to be posted to all local residents. They never received anything.</p> <p>No figures have been provided to support claims that the scheme will make it easier for local residents and businesses to park nearby.</p> <p>The overall parking capacity vs. the demand from local residents and businesses should be tested. As there are many HMO's in the area. Results should be published and publicly consulted on before RPS is introduced.</p> <p>The areas currently proposed pay and display will reduce the space in which locals can park. These bays should be mixed use.</p> <p>The 1 hour max stay is not going to reduce the traffic circulating the area. It will, however, reduce trade for local businesses. A maximum stay of 2 – 3 hours would be better.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>1.3 5.10</p> <p>3.5 5.10</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>4.2</p>

		<p>Long operating hours of the scheme are likely to damage evening trade. Would be better if the scheme ended at 6pm.</p> <p>The charges for permits are expensive. Over the last few years living costs have increased while incomes have not. This will apply more pressure on residents.</p> <p>Proposals claim the costs of parking should only cover the administration and enforcement of the scheme. Yet the charges proposed are greater than the areas.</p> <p>Public transport is expensive, unreliable and the routes are not adequate. They cannot get across town without having to change bus. First no longer issue return tickets. Before a parking scheme is introduced local bus networks need to be improved.</p> <p>The consultation process has not been completed yet signs seem to have already been put up in preparation for the scheme going ahead. Which they feel makes a mockery of the process.</p> <p>They feel RPS has been ill considered and unsuitable for the area.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2.2.3</p> <p>1 2.1 2.2</p>
921		<p>This is a family man struggling with flat wages and steep inflation. He is angry to be hit with another tax.</p> <p>Concerned that more businesses will relocate to out of town malls and business parks.</p> <p>Feels that the way it has been introduced in undemocratic and thoroughly dishonest.</p>	<p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
922		<p>They object to the pay and display outside 6 Gordon Road because the TRO 1340 has been implemented. This allows parents to drop off and collect their children with a maximum waiting time of 15 minutes between 8am and 4.30pm Mon – Fri. If RPS is introduced the same boundary of 6 Gordon Rd will change to pay and display. This concerns them as other people will be able to use this space for shopping in Queens Rd and the space will not be available for parents. Also, the timing does not allow for limited waiting from 8.30am, when the pre-school opens.</p> <p>RPS should have a maximum free waiting time of 15 minutes, starting from 8.30 to coincide with the opening times.</p>	<p>5.16</p> <p>5.16</p>
923		<p>Objecting to the scheme because it would be highly detrimental to the area and would not benefit residents, businesses or visitors.</p>	<p>1</p>
924		<p>They work for Trigon Pensions (over 30 employees) located on the Promenade. There is not a sufficient number of permits offered to businesses.</p> <p>Local business will suffer as they bring custom to shops and restaurants in the Village if the larger</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p>

		businesses relocate.	
		They believe that a review of the public transport should be undertaken before parking measures are introduced. A better public transport system would allow many people to travel to work effectively.	4.5
925		<p>Feels that BCC pushed RPS in areas with least opposition and are now forcing it city wide, against the people wishes.</p> <p>In order to thrive economically the city absolutely needs to facilitate the free movement of people.</p> <p>Commuters occupy parking vacated by residents going to work, when residents return in the evening their spaces are available again. They feel this unregulated system works.</p> <p>Feels that BCC is saddling Bristol road users with a £10 million debt, feels this is a poor way to treat people who are already hard pressed.</p> <p>Is the cost of permits capped or is it likely to increase?</p> <p>They feel that there are few alternatives to car transport. Bur routes are not convenient; Bristol is wet and hilly, not ideal for cyclists. In addition to this people need to transport goods, shopping or children around for day to day life, not just fun.</p> <p>States that most road improvement schemes prioritise buses, cycles and pedestrians over vehicles. No wonder that congestion is increasing?</p> <p>They are worried that the charges are likely to increase.</p> <p>They believe existing congestion in the city can be mitigated by careful consideration of individual problems, for example changing traffic light priority to favour vehicles at peak time only, would reduce the congestion without greatly inconveniencing pedestrians.</p>	<p>1 2.1 2.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>1</p>
926		<p>They write to object to the parking in Northcote Road. There are 15 residential households with cars (some two car households). This particular road suffers from parked cars from those visiting the zoo and Clifton Prep School which affects our ability to park in the evenings.</p> <p>He states that residents on Pembroke, College and Cecil Road are being given designated parking spaces.</p> <p>Feels that it will only be a matter of time before commuters find out that Northcote Road is a safe place to park.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.3 4.2</p>

		This resident often has to park several hundred yards away on busy days, this scheme will make this impossible as individuals will be competing for parking space. Residents, especially elderly and handicapped will have their quality of life threatened by these proposals.	3.3 4.2.6
927		<p>Feels this scheme will harm trade and drive business away from the area.</p> <p>1 hour parking is no good for hair dressers or restaurants etc.</p> <p>Permit numbers are not adequate as they have 30 staff.</p> <p>They currently travel from Weston Super Mare and it takes them 25-35 mins. The best you can offer is Park &amp; Ride which will make my journey 1.5 hours.</p>	1.3 4.1.3  4.2  4.3  4.5 4.6
928		<p>The scheme should not operate on Saturdays, and should not run till 9pm.</p> <p>The business they work for in The Promenade will be impacted. With only a small number of parking permits and the inability to park on the street over half of the staff will have no choice but to leave if there is not another way to commute.</p> <p>They live in Portishead and they will find it extremely difficult for them to commute by public transport.</p>	3.4  4.3 4.4 4.6  4.5 4.6
929		<p>They are objecting on behalf of The Clifton Hotel Group.</p> <p>The operating hours of Pay and Display around the hotel Mon – Sat, 9am – 9pm, 3 hour limit with no return is going to be unworkable for hotels guest. Guests will have nowhere to park during the day.</p> <p>The hotel has 31 rooms and 5 spaces.</p> <p>RPS threatens the ability for corporate guests to arrive between 8am and 9am for a conference that lasts for 6-8 hours on average. Go into the Village for lunch and spend money. If there is no parking available they will lose conference guests.</p> <p>Wedding guests will not be able to park.</p> <p>All guests will be inconvenienced if they had to move their cars every three hours. If it is difficult to park these guests will move to other hotels.</p> <p>Making sure guests don't leave with them will be a burden for reception, will make them appear inefficient and will encourage guests to seek other hotels. The permit is worth £250, more than the</p>	Noted  3.4 4.3.4  Noted  4.3.4  4.2 4.6.4  4.2.1 4.6.4  1.3





		<p>A high VED band car may only travel a few years each year and produce less emissions than a low VED band car driven many miles. Attempts to convince people to move to lower emissions cars by unfairly and illegally charging them for the same service as a lower VED band car are misguided as the emissions produced by manufacturing a new car will far out way keeping the older car.</p> <p>I believe that the proposed costs are far too high, and I do not believe the council has sufficiently investigated technology to more effectively manage the issue of permits.</p> <p>Surely an online system can be implemented to avoid the large labour that must be associated with the current scheme.</p>	<p>3.2</p> <p>3.2.1 3.1.2</p> <p>6.2</p>
935		<p>I note that it is proposed that my road's parking restrictions are to run from 9am to 9pm Monday to Saturday. However, restrictions in other parts of Clifton are planned to be only 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday – yet we get no extra visitor permits.</p> <p>Should my elderly parents wish to visit on a Saturday, they will find they have a problem, and will have to park in the NCP car park which is at a cost, not to mention a walk away.</p> <p>I would request that Richmond Hill is either subject to the 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday restrictions that are proposed for other Clifton areas or alternatively if the restrictions are to extend to 9pm Monday to Saturday we should at the very least be issued with additional visitor permits to account for this.</p>	<p>3.4 3.6</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.4 3.6</p>
936		<p>TRO 1340 has just been implemented this is greatly overdue as it was sealed on the 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2013. This will allow us parents to drop off and collect children, with a maximum waiting time of 15 mins between 8 and 4 30 Monday to Friday. It was a condition of the Clifton Children's House Planning permission, and we consider it a positive move.</p> <p>If the proposed RPS comes into effect, the same boundary of 6 Gordon Road will change to pay and display. Our concerns for the pre-school are that other people will be able to use this space either up to 30mins free or 1 hour paid, for shopping in Queen's Road and the space will not be free for parents of the school. The timing does not allow for limited waiting from 8 30 when the pre-school opens.</p> <p>TRO 1340 which meets the school's needs and is particular to the circumstances of the pre-school, should remain; failing this, under the RPS a maximum free waiting time of 15 minutes should be implemented, starting from 8 30 so as to coincide with our opening time.</p>	<p>5.16</p> <p>5.16</p> <p>5.16</p>
937		<p>The scheme is not workable in its current state as the revised plans are flawed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

938		<p>There has been minimal consultation with the residents of the affected area over the current issues in parking and how these could be addressed.</p> <p>We received no notification of the previous residents feedback period noted in September 13 as described on the Council website at our address.</p> <p>The scheme proposals for Clifton Village and in particular the Western end of Princess Victoria Street where it meets Sion Hill simply do not fulfil the aims of RPS. There are simply less parking spaces on your proposal than currently available making the situation worse than present.</p> <p>It has been calculated locally that there are at least 32 less spaces available to residents than at present, due to all of Wellington Terrace (where I can normally find a space for my car with little issue at present) being handled over to pay and display (no residents permit parking). This is simply ludicrous.</p> <p>The Hotel have parking at the rear which is little used as their guests like to park out front, already taking away spaces from residents. If these are now all pay and display only, returning from work would mean there will be no local residents spaces left, (less than we already have) but I would have to pay and display as well as paying for two car permits as neither my work or my partners are served by public transport routes.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>5.18 6</p> <p>3.3 6</p> <p>3.3 3.4</p>
939		<p>I gave up my car thinking it wise to do so at 92 but now I greatly need visits from family and friends and nurses on occasion. Please put the needs of your residents and rate payers before shoppers, for them we are on a good bus route and not far from multi storey parking.</p>	<p>3.6 3.7 4.6.4</p>
940		<p>Some members of staff would have to leave my employment if the parking scheme came in as proposed.</p> <p>The business permits are prohibitively expensive for a small, independent business such as mine. Even if I could afford them, I am only able to buy two.</p> <p>My staff numbers are obviously higher than 2 and several of my staff members travel to work in a car because there is no suitable alternative for them and also because of the nature of my business which includes a catering delivery wind, often means that they need to deliver catering for us. There is no suitable alternative parking for my staff members – there is no car park nearby and the suggested park and ride service is so far out of the way for many of my staff who come from the other side of Bristol that it makes it unfeasible for them to use and also fails to solve the problem of needing their car to do catering deliveries.</p> <p>There is a lack of alternative transportation for visitors to Clifton Village.</p> <p>The inability to stay for any length of time in the central part of the village can only have detrimental effects on the trade of many businesses in the Village. Whilst I appreciate there is an argument that</p>	<p>4.1.3 4.3</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.3 4.6.4 4.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.2</p>

		<p>limiting the time for visitors to come to the village over the course of a day, in my opinion, 1 hour is far too short. Visitors cannot do very much in this time they cannot have a haircut, go to lunch etc.</p> <p>The 1 hour parking, the lack of business permits on offer and prohibitively expensive charge per permit, and the length of time that the parking restrictions extend to in the evening will mean that businesses will have no choice but to leave.</p> <p>For food businesses that rely very heavily on trade from other retailers and office workers, reduction in this type of customer could be disastrous.</p> <p>Making the parking situation potentially easier for residents will not help our business at all – there is a limit to how many residents can visit our business during the week given that many work outside the village during the day.</p> <p>Fewer visitors will be able to park in the Village, some potential visitors will not be willing to pay to park, and those that are willing to pay to park can only park in the centre for an hour and therefore will not have the ability to visit the broad range of wonderful independent businesses that Clifton Village currently homes.</p> <p>Bus travel is limited and almost always requires changes, making journeys long and expensive. Train travel across Bristol is almost non-existent and we obviously have no tube/metro system.</p> <p>Parking schemes are only justifiable in an area such as Clifton, where they will have such an impact on the local businesses, if there is suitable alternative infrastructure and/or alternative parking methods such as car parks – which Bristol and specifically Clifton do not offer at present.</p> <p>The scheme could have life changing effects on business owners and staff members that you will not be able to re-dress by way of review. 6 months is too long for a review and many businesses will not be able to cope with a significant drop in trade for this period.</p>	<p>4.1.3 4.2 3.4</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.2 4.1</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.3 4.5</p> <p>4.1.3 6.</p>
941		<p>Clifton Village currently has a lack of integrated transport links for staff and visitors.</p> <p>The 1 hour parking is detrimental to individual traders as well as Clifton as a whole. Customers come to my premise for a lesson which lasts over an hour and they tend to incorporate a stroll around the village popping into other business and lunch, in this current situation this wouldn't be feasible for visitors.</p> <p>If the main aim is to reduce commuters using Clifton Village as a car park then why does the RPS need to be on a Saturday?</p> <p>As a trader I am keen to seek additional consultation to redress the inadequate consultation to date</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>2.1</p>

		<p>due to missing the crucial initial phase.</p> <p>Initial consultation – this phase didn't occur, Councillors of Bristol City Council decided to fast track this stage of the process. Informal consultation – This phase took place although it was a week shorter than planned, Bristol City Council cut short this stage by one week.</p>	<p>2.2</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>
942		<p>There is absolutely no need to operate the scheme on the weekends or after 6pm. This would be indicative of a motive for raising revenue rather than reducing the number of commuters parking in Clifton. The vast majority of people who park in Clifton and work in the city centre do not work to 9pm on weekdays nor do they work Sundays.</p> <p>This scheme would be crippling to our local business.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p>
943		<p>The introduction of pay and display charges will do nothing to improve the parking situation over and above that already in place by the restricted parking areas, commuters cannot park in these areas at present.</p> <p>The north side of Suspension Bridge Road is currently free of any parking restriction and should be converted to residents parking areas this would overcome the problem of commuter parking and allow residents a reasonable chance to find a parking space. Alternatively, if pay and display is deemed to be effective it should offer free parking to residents who will have paid for a permit.</p> <p>To summarise, leave the south side of suspension bridge road as it is and create residents parking along the north side of suspension bridge road.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p>
944		<p>I work long hours in Somerset and do not normally get home until 8pm. I will not benefit from restricted parking during the day and feel it is unacceptable to be made to pay to park outside my own home.</p> <p>This will give no benefit to the majority of Clifton residents and appears to be solely a Council money making scheme.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.1</p>
945		<p>This scheme will completely change the nature of Clifton Village and destroy the character of this important conservation area. The village atmosphere will disappear completely with ugly road marking and an army of enforcement operatives.</p> <p>The village's thriving retail environment will suffer irreparable damage.</p> <p>Making us pay for parking permits will not make parking easier as the fundamental problem is that the converted Regency houses on my street have up to ten flats and a frontage for parking only two</p>	<p>4.1.5</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>6</p> <p>3.5</p>

		cars.  I have not seen any evidence of the so-called 'commuter parking issue' that you are supposedly addressing.  The way this scheme is being forced up us is utterly undemocratic and appears to be more about revenue generation than the needs of residents.	1  2.1 2.2 3.1.1
946		It is a landmark village that people flock to from all over the world. It already struggles to keep shops open but if the parking restrictions come in, it will, over time, have the life blood squeezed out of it. The one hour parking idea has sadly been thought up by someone who has never been shown any love or affection in their lives.	4.2 1.3 4.1.3
947		It is entirely evident that no or insufficient statistical research has been carried out to take account of the activity and demographics of traders, office workers, shoppers, diners and service users.  The proposals are excessively inappropriate, consultations have been truncated and questions by BID and the Chamber of Commerce have been ignored.  Should BCC steam-roller the scheme, the case for a complete review by the minister of State is highly tenable and advisable.  The installation of cumbersome, unsightly black parking ticket machines in Clifton Village would be entirely inappropriate with which I believe BCC in fact agrees having described the small number of BT fast broadband green boxes proposed, as not appropriate in a listed area such as Clifton.	1  2.1  2.1 2.2  4.1.5
948		Consideration should be given to medical staff working out of 2 Clifton Park, who have to work between different sites and need a vehicle to transport heavy equipment such as lasers between sites.  I would like to request a parking permit to allow this treatment for premature babies in the Neonatal Intensive Care Units in Southmead and St. Michael's Hospitals.  I would like to register our objection to a scheme requiring the purchase of 'customer permits' to allow elderly, immobile and partially sighted patients to attend appointments with their doctors in 2 Clifton Park.	4.3 3.7  3.7  1.3
949		Should the RPS be introduced, I will be unable to drive to work as my working day is longer than the suggested 5 hour limit on pay and display.  There are two options: a bus followed by at least a walk of 1 mile from Ashton Court or Hotwells or driving to Shirehampton, then a train to Clifton Down followed by a walk of approx 1 mile. None of the public transport options are viable as they would involve changes and walking distances which are	4.3 4.6.4  4.5 4.6 4.6.4

		<p>not possible with the amount of books and other items we need to carry.</p> <p>My job entails me working late for Parents' evenings and other school events, relying on public transport would sometimes mean waiting for buses or trains only running once every hour. This is not feasible after a full day at work and possibly children in tow.</p> <p>Should the RPS be introduced there will be no practical means for me to be able to continue my employment at Clifton High School. I would be forced to consider alternative employment unless staff at schools within the Clifton RPS are given the option to purchase an annual parking permit.</p>	<p>4.3</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.3</p>
950		<p>We are concerned regarding the reduction in the total number of parking spaces in Clifton, the time constriction per space and tariff all having a negative effect on the vibrancy of the Village.</p> <p>If the aim of this proposal is to reduce the number of commuters traveling into our city, then other less restrictive schemes have been shown to work perfectly well. For example having a form of residents parking from 7-10am daily, thus deterring commuters.</p> <p>As residents we are also concerned about the extensive hours the RPS will be enforced in our immediate area, 9am to 9pm Monday to Saturday.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>3.4.4</p> <p>3.4.5</p> <p>3.4</p>
951		<p>The scheme as it is proposed is unsuitable considering the structure and function of Clifton as a village with a high population density.</p> <p>Being able to come home and park across my garage means I am able to come home during night hours and park quickly and safely, this would not be possible with the proposed scheme.</p> <p>As a young woman I am not comfortable having to walk around the streets at all hours to be able to park and return home after a shift at work.</p>	<p>3.5</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.4</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
952		<p>The roads leading off Christchurch Green (Canyngge Road and Clifton Park Road) need to be restricted 9am to 9pm otherwise residents will not be able to park on returning home from work.</p> <p>Metered parking on Clifton Down Road should be shared parking to allow residents to also park there.</p> <p>Christchurch Church is very popular and used throughout the week, including most evenings. This will mean that roads around the Church where residents parking is currently only running to 5pm will be used by church goers to the detriment of residents.</p> <p>A scheme needs to be devised that works for residents, businesses, churches, schools alike. Clifton is not like most other areas; it attracts visitors for a whole host of reasons. Those visitors will still need to park.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>3.3</p>
953		<p>There is absolutely no need to operate the scheme on the weekends or after 6pm. This would be</p>	<p>3.4</p>

	<p>indicative of a motive for raising revenue rather than reducing the number of commuters parking in Clifton. The vast majority of people who park in Clifton and work in the City Centre do not work to 9pm on week days nor do they work Sundays.</p> <p>This scheme would be crippling to our local businesses.</p>	<p>3.1.1</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p>
954	<p>We cannot understand how any visitors to Clifton will be accommodated for longer than an hour, it will simply not be worth our while traveling from Hertfordshire to stay overnight with our daughter, unless we arrive after 9pm and leave at the crack of dawn.</p> <p>We have regularly dined and shopped in the Village. From our understanding this will no longer be feasible, meaning the local economy will not be in receipt of our and other visitor's hard earned money.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>4.2 4.1.3 6</p>
955	<p>Limiting the parking to 1 hour in the Village and imposing multiple residents spaces will result in a direct loss of trade. Parking restrictions will give shoppers more reason to head to the out of town shopping centres. If Clifton loses its trade, it will lose its heart. Loss of trade means empty shops, less safe streets, lower property prices.</p> <p>Having lived and worked in Clifton Village for some time, I do not have difficulties parking. Customers to my family's shops seem to find spaces easily enough, as do we when we load and unload stock.</p> <p>Many services offered by the independent businesses in Clifton can't be managed in an hour. Wedding dress fittings and women's hair appointments to name a few. The local traders in Clifton rely on each other to bring customers through the door. The businesses need customers who are able to spend time in the area, not just an hour or two.</p> <p>It's not practical to think that everyone can travel by bike or public transport. Imposing parking restrictions won't effect this change. It will just make people go elsewhere.</p> <p>The infrastructure is too poor to allow Clifton's workers to travel in, let alone shoppers. In addition, the small numbers of work permits that are proposed are not enough and will make it impossible to carry out normal work practises.</p> <p>The fragile balance of Clifton Village will be destroyed if the current plans are put in place. As they stand the plans threaten the economic viability of the village.</p> <p>Don't let these plans go through without proper consultation. The process was fast tracked and missed a crucial 'initial consultation' phase. Please make sure due and proper consultation is given before proceeding with plans as they stand.</p>	<p>4.2 4.1 4.1.3</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.5 1.3</p> <p>4.5 4.3</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
956	<p>Why should the street I live in have differing time restrictions compared to others without due consideration of the number of visitors permits I am entitled to?</p>	<p>3.4 3.6</p>

		The extra signage, street markings and pay machines will detrimentally alter the image and eclectic feel of the area.	4.1.5
		Why am I being taxed on friends and family who visit me at home?	3.6
		This is likely to affect the value of my property – the vast majority of residents don't live in £1m town houses and work hard to afford relatively small abodes.	1.2
		Why should the parking permit for my Ford Fiesta cost more than permits for other areas of the City?	3.1.4
		This may not be a bedroom tax but it is a tax on my conjugal relations with my non domiciled partner.	3.6
		In terms of increasing revenue what modelling has been done and by whom?	3.1.1 5.10
		Where is the Cost Benefits Analysis? – I can see that from the litigation produced already there has been a considerable cost outlaid for the planning.	3.1.1
		What is the cost to physically implement the scheme in terms of; Ticket machines and the on-going maintenance through life?	3.1.1
		Policing the scheme e.g. extra wardens, coin collectors etc.	3.1.1
		The administrative burden required for issuing permits, following up offenders, material costs in addition to accounting costs and time.	3.1.1
957		What is the perceived benefit, where will the benefit be realised and how will this benefit be measured?	1.2 1.3 6
		What alternatives have been considered and have life cycle costs been measured to attain the best option to take forward? – For instance why not increase council tax by due consideration, for the number and types of vehicles registered at an address; this can be cross referenced with the DVLA; thereby reducing all this expense and ridding the very local fear of a detrimental change to the appearance, visitor appeal and 'feel' of the village.	1
		I live in Frenchay and I would take over 2 hours and 2 buses to get to work. Or a 8 mile bike ride which despite enjoying cycling, is not something I should have to commit to everyday and is not something I am willing to do in the winter months.	4.3 4.5 4.6
		This parking scheme has had no consultation with business.	2.1.3



		Inadequate transport links.	4.5
		Too few permits being offered to local businesses to enable parking on the street.	4.3
		1 hour parking meters is too short a time for the Village if you wish to conduct business at a local restaurant or establishment.	4.2
958		I object to the revised RPS proposal implementing a pay and display only area on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. If introduced the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents and businesses of Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings by reducing the number of parking spaces available to residents and businesses by half.	5.8
		We urge BCC to look at this again and reinstate Suspension Bridge Road as a shared pay and display/residents permit scheme in line with the original proposals.	5.8
		We are also concerned that BCC has not afforded residents a reasonable opportunity to respond to these significantly revised proposals which we understand include 90 revisions in total.	2.2
		BCC has not written to residents inviting any comment (e.g. by postcard as it did previously), and has permitted only a limited three week period within which to respond.	2.2
959		I operate a Physiotherapy Practise from Litfield House. I have specialist staff from Thornbury and Weston Super Mare to treat patients. There is no staff parking at Litfield House, my staff will be greatly affected if the residents parking scheme comes into effect.	4.3 4.4
		The area of Camp Road in which Litfield House borders has an abundance of parking due to the houses having off street parking. Simply there is no problem at the moment.	1.2.2
		If you implement the scheme you must provide sufficient passes for business to operate under this scheme.	4.3 4.4
		My reception staff who earn £8 per hour would simply have no choice but to leave my employment.	4.1.3 4.6
960		I feel that the needs of Clifton businesses and residents have been overlooked or disregarded in your proposal to capitalise on the prospect of parking limitations in this area.	2.1 2.2
		Your proposals will discourage visitors to the village to spend money in our local businesses.	4.1.1
		It will add financial burden to residents for something to which they should be and currently are entitled to; parking their vehicle. The parking of one's vehicle can be arduous at times but this is due to the number of residents and the road space available.	1.2 3.3.1 3.1

		What you propose with permits will only reduce the vehicles in the number of those who can afford permits. This will either have no real impact on parking or at best discriminate against those in poorest financial situation.	3.1.2 3.5
961		<p>It is short sighted in terms of negatively effecting small businesses in the village and having a detrimental effect on the look and feel of a special area within the city.</p> <p>Public transport is not strong enough, or frequent enough with its routes that currently give access to the Village. I sometimes have to work late, into hours that are not supported by the public transport network in order for me to get home.</p> <p>I cannot afford to park in the car parks you suggest to use, which are equally far away for me to reach on a dark evening.</p> <p>I object to your negligence to safety of women in the city at night, with badly lit areas and unsafe routes of commuting. I need to go through many underpasses if I walk or cycle, and these areas are badly lit.</p> <p>I feel this scheme has not been a consultation, it seems like it has been bull dozed through.</p>	1.3 4.1.3  4.5  4.3 4.6.4 4.6  4.6 1.4 3.8  2.1 2.2
962		I object to the Clifton Village parking scheme proposals on the grounds that it is fundamentally flawed and will require significant change to make it a viable proposal and fit for purpose from the point of view of residents, local businesses, customers, shoppers and visitors taking into account the important and specific local cultural, social and architectural aspects of the area.	1. 2.1 2.2
963		<p>We would not object in principle to the introduction of a parking scheme within Clifton Village but we do object to the lack of consideration of the needs of the school as a provider of public service (that cannot be relocated elsewhere than its current position) within the scheme.</p> <p>Education is a special case. This has been recognised by the mayor from the outset but isn't recognised within the scheme design. The schools of Clifton have met with the council on a number of occasions to discuss our needs and have provided the council with detailed information on staff numbers, staff travel and permits required. The Council is fully aware of the demands of schools and the needs of staff.</p> <p>The operational hours of the permit scheme are not applicable to the needs of schools. Most staff arrive at school by 8am. The current operational hours of the scheme run from 9am to 9pm which does not allow staff to use the permits at the time they will be arriving.</p>	1  4.3 4.4 4.6  3.4

		<p>The operational hours of the permit scheme also do not enable parents to use the 30 minute free parking zone for drop off. They will be parking and dropping off between 8:30-8:55am. The uncertainty around the scheme is making parents and carers of the school unsettled as they worry about how they are going to be able to reasonably and safely drop off and pick up their children to and from school.</p>	3.4
		<p>Clifton Village is not just a residential area – it is, and always has been, mixed use. If this scheme is to work it must recognise and be to the benefit of all permanent users of the space not just one. We are concerned that the capacity calculations for this scheme are not based on hard data or case study and worry that the scheme could prove unworkable.</p>	3.3
		<p>We request a change to the operational hours of the scheme in the Royal Park square to 8am-6pm.</p>	3.4
		<p>The annual cost of parking permits to the school would be almost equivalent to one child's education for the year. To pay to park where currently there is no charge, either the children must suffer loss of funding or staff would suffer loss of income, which in turn may result in them seeking employment elsewhere.</p>	4.6 3.2.1
		<p>We request that state funded schools are either given permits free or allowed to buy permits at a more reasonable rate than £175 each.</p>	3.2.1
		<p>The uncertainty surrounding this scheme is making staff unsettled and considering alternative options for employment. The impact of potential loss of good staff in a school should not be taken lightly be the Council.</p>	4.1.3
		<p>The transport infrastructure both within Bristol and in from the surrounds is notoriously poor, making sustainable travel to work onerous, particularly for those travelling into the city with children books and equipment, or at unsociable hours in order to arrive at work or stay later in order to prepare lessons.</p>	4.5 4.6
964		<p>The provision of corporate bus membership, electric bikes, match funding for showers, bike racks and 1:1 travel planning and re-routing the number 505 buses are certainly beneficial but still woefully inadequate when you consider the public transport infrastructure of other cities of comparable size and importance to Bristol. The government standards for modal shift in car usage are only possible if other reasonable alternatives are provided.</p>	4.5 4.6
		<p>We have not had enough consultation over this as the Council have fast tracked the scheme without giving local residents and businesses enough opportunities to discuss difficulties.</p> <p>Many of my clients are elderly or disabled and rely on cars to travel to see us. Often, due to ill health they can only walk a short distance.</p>	2.1 2.2  4.2.6 1.3

		You will be reducing the number of parking spaces in Clifton.	3.3
		I have between 5 and 10 people working at my premises, where will they park as they cannot all have a permit?	4.3 4.4
965		It is my opinion that there are many fundamental flaws in the proposed plans, which are to the detriment of employees working in the Village.	4.3 4.6
		I now understand that should the proposed plans come into force, that I will not be able to park on the street – nor in fact within a reasonable radius of the office.	4.4 4.6.4
		Whilst there is a suggestion that public transport might be a viable alternative, there are currently no direct buses from Bedminster to Clifton Village – and therefore my commute to work will increase significantly. Similarly, the cost of getting to will be set to rise to a cost that is likely to be unfeasible.	4.5 4.6
966		I object to the proposed parking restrictions in this street, 9am-9pm Monday to Saturday, where other streets have 9am-5pm which divides the day in a much more logical way for those who work here and for those returning here to their homes as the local workers leave. Longer restrictions must surely be matched with extra permits for residents.	3.4 3.6
		I fear that Bristol will get a reputation as a virtually ‘no go’ area with a scheme as rigorous as this. Anyone from outside the City, with this proposed parking regime, and currently unreliable and slow bus service, will surely be deterred from coming here.	4.5 1
		I feel that this plan will diminish greatly my quality of life vis-à-vis evening visitors – especially the elderly who need to use a car – also managing to get four very small grandchildren in and out of the house safely with waiting restrictions in place.	3.6 3.3.1
967		I am extremely concerned that the proposed changes and the widespread 1 hour parking limit will be extremely detrimental to business trade in Clifton Village.	4.2
		Clifton village is a beautiful, historic place enjoyed by many. It is vital that changes to parking don't destroy its unique charm.	1
968		Current system works that you sometimes are able to get a space. This currently works on pot luck and the ability to drive further afield and park your car on other roads. This system works in its own way.	1
		My concerns with parking schemes is if every area has different resident schemes this becomes very problematic as you cannot park further afield.	1
		Also parking is currently free so not finding a space is fair. Bringing in a paid permit can surely only mean that a certain percentage of people are effectively buying thin air as there is not enough	3.3

		<p>spaces available for people in the area. So you have paid money for permit that in fact gives you nothing.</p> <p>The removal of parking for people working in the city only frees up spaces in the day really, which is while the majority of residents are at work. The time needed to park is in the evening. Currently parking is very difficult at night as there is not enough spaces available for the amount people/properties in the area so I am not sure how the permits would resolve this and therefore why are they being introduced?</p> <p>These parking schemes will drive a lot of people out of the city and also a lot of businesses. Fundamentally this could really damage the city leaving it with dead centres and empty neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3 6</p>
969		We own and operate a growing financial services company and we regularly have clients visit our office. These meetings typically last in excess of 2 hours and it is unreasonable to expect clients to pay when it has always been free.	<p>4.3 4.1</p>
970		Identical to objection 936.	See objection 936
971		<p>The proposed parking, non-parking and/or time limited areas are a chaotic hotchpotch of fragmented spaces that area already causing confusion to the public.</p> <p>The fees are very high. There is no guarantee that in a year after implementation, once a fait accompli has been established, they will not double.</p> <p>The Council is treating this scheme as a milk cow in order to extract more revenue from the sitting duck residents and businesses of this area.</p> <p>There are a large number of older people in this area and not everybody is able to ride a bike, and the present bus services are erratic and very expensive.</p> <p>Not enough permit places are being supplied for the residents who own cars in the area. What does the Council expect them to do? Get rid of their cars?</p> <p>If the Council enforce parking restrictions as at present proposed, and the outrageously high charges for permits for those businesses, many will go under and be taken over by the more undesirable chains.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.1.2 3.2.1 3.1.4</p> <p>3.1.1 3.1.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.3.1 3.5</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p>

		<p>It seems to me there are other means of restricting parking only to those who live and work in the community. For starters, the Council could require Bristol University and UWE to ban undergraduates from keeping cars in Bristol. This would immediately free up thousands of spaces.</p> <p>The Council could consider a longer term plan of building large underground car parks under the Downs – Bristol is endowed with plenty of hills and park spaces.</p> <p>The Government mantra is ‘we are all in this together.’ It seems that some of us are more ‘in it’ than others: is a residents parking scheme going to be implemented in Hartcliffe, Knowle, Totterdown, Stapleton, Easton? Supposing RPS was being imposed on these areas but not on zones such as Clifton/Redland/Cotham, people would be screaming ‘discrimination.’</p>	<p>3.5</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>1</p>
972		<p>I understand that the proposed changes to Royal York Crescent involve permits to park on one side and a complete ban on parking on the crescent side. There is limited parking as it is without unnecessarily removing these spaces and removing these will increase the congestion in other areas.</p> <p>Many Residents require their cars for work but will find with the new proposals that they won't be able to park when they return at the end of the day if the limitations stretch to 9pm.</p> <p>To simply suggest that these people should use public transport instead would be wholly delusional given the sad state of public transport. Whilst my complaint about the service First Group provides is a separate subject, it certainly goes to show that the infrastructure is not there for residents who currently use their cars.</p> <p>This will further mean that residents like myself who use public transport will have nowhere to leave our cars during the day as the limited parking bays are sure to be oversubscribed. Would-be criminals would sure to spot a car lying around in the same space for days and target that vehicle safe in the knowledge that the owner isn't around.</p>	<p>5.5</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
973		<p>There was a strong opinion that the parking would run from 9am till 7pm, but I see this has now changed to 9 till 9. Most residents are home from work by 7pm. The extension to 9pm will have a deleterious effect on the local residents.</p> <p>I don't see why the scheme also applies on Saturdays. Many of my non-Clifton friends enjoy shopping in Clifton on Saturdays and I think they will be deterred from doing so if they have to pay to come in by car. They will shop elsewhere, to the detriment of local business.</p> <p>There should be much greater ability to park for 2 hours. 1 hour is nowhere long enough for people who want to just visit one or two shops.</p> <p>Please ensure that the double yellow lines extend to just beyond the garage entrance – partly for</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.4 4.1.1 4.1.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>5.18</p>

		safety reasons of driving out but also so that we can operate the up and over motorized garage door.	
974		Identical to objection 973.	See objection 973
975		<p>If introduced, the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents and businesses of Gloucester Row and Beaufort Buildings by reducing the number of parking spaces available to residents and businesses by half.</p> <p>We are also concerned that BCC has not afforded us a reasonable opportunity to respond to these significantly revised proposals which we understand include 90 revisions in total. BCC has not written to residents inviting any comment (e.g. by postcard as it did previously) and has permitted only a limited 3 week period within which to respond.</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>2.2</p>
976		<p>I live in Chewton Mendip, 18 miles to the south of Bristol and I have no option but to use my car because I have to drop/collect my children from school on my route to work.</p> <p>Alternative transport links are not suitable the bus will take too long and does not fit into child care commitments.</p> <p>If I use the Park and Ride the closest option is at Long Ashton and this will take me the same time and is the same mileage to drive to park and ride as if I was driving directly to Clifton, but then have to catch the bus to the city centre or walk up to Clifton adding further travel time and making it impossible to get to work on time or collect the children.</p> <p>Will not be able to use a motorbike or lift share for the same reasons listed above.</p> <p>The cost of using the bus or park and ride will substantially add to the cost of my travel and as a part time working mother is a cost I cannot afford.</p>	<p>4.3 4.6 4.6.4</p> <p>4.6 4.3</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.6</p>
977		<p>It is refreshing to see all shops let and a thriving business environment in the current economy, but this is a direct result of the free parking that Clifton offers, this encourages people to visit Clifton and support local businesses.</p> <p>With the proposed scheme both the cost and time frames will mean people won't visit, businesses fail and the heart of the Clifton community is lost.</p> <p>I also feel that the proposed plans are very confusing for residents with different rules for different streets.</p> <p>I will still not have a place to park guaranteed and will have to pay for this.</p>	<p>4.1</p> <p>4.1.3 3.4</p> <p>3.3 3.4</p> <p>3.3.1</p>
978		An all-day parking scheme until 9pm in the evening will have a devastating effect on the traders and those that work in Clifton Village, especially given the restriction on the time people can park in close	3.4

		<p>proximity to the village.</p> <p>I do not think it is necessary for the scheme to apply on Saturdays. I fail to understand why it was decided to extend the hours of the scheme since the last consultation.</p> <p>If the Mayor wishes to deter commuters then why not restrict parking in the mornings between the hours of 8am to 11am and 5pm to 7pm.</p> <p>I believe the proposed scheme contradicts the Government policy of 'improving high streets and town centres' which states that our high streets need to be social places with a vibrant evening economy and to offer something that neither shopping centres nor the internet can match. The policy states that independent experts have warned that aggressive parking policies are harming local high streets and local shops. This is surely one such aggressive policy.</p> <p>We do not have adequate transport infrastructure in place so that people can commute to the village and consequently believe this scheme will result in fewer people coming to Clifton which may ultimately see the demise of the village.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.4.4 3.4.5</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1 4.1.3</p> <p>4.5</p>
979		<p>I understand that consideration is being given to having yellow lines on the crescent side of the road. I currently have a bicycle stored in a neighbour's garage and use it frequently. The neighbour will start parking in her garage if she is unable to park in front of it. It would seem to be the ultimate irony of the parking scheme if I end up using our car more because I am unable to use my bicycle.</p>	5.5
980		<p>Identical to objection 936.</p>	5.16
981		<p>The Avon Gorge Hotel seeks additional consultation to redress the lack of an initial consultation prior to September 2013 which was fast tracked.</p> <p>Extremely concerned about the operating hours of Pay and Display around the hotel: Monday to Saturday 9am to 9pm, 3 hour limit with no return.</p> <p>The removal of the double yellow line. The hotel is the legal owner of princess lane and double yellow line enforceable by the local authority is imperative to stop local resident or commuters parking at the top of the lane.</p> <p>These operating hours would impact our overnight guest, conference and events delegate, wedding guests.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>3.4 4.2</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>3.4 4.3.4</p>



		<p>The corporate guest usually arrives between 5pm and 7pm. If he arrives at 5pm he would then have to move his car at 8pm. He would not be able to return to the same section within the hour. If he is staying more than one night, it would be impossible for him to leave his car for that length of time. The only solution would be to park in the nearest NCP over 1 mile away.</p> <p>The conference guest will arrive at the hotel between 8am and 9am and attends a conference at the hotel for an average period of 6 to 8 hours.</p> <p>The wedding guest arrives at noon and can be attending until 1am the next day. The proposed pay and display as they stand would be totally inadequate to our business needs and would be crippling.</p> <p>On the basis that the Clifton South zone highlights the needs to take in consideration hotel guests; we suggest that Bristol City Council follows the precedent of other cities who implemented permit controlled parking along with a "Hotel and guest house permit."</p> <p>The scheme needs to take into consideration conference, events and wedding guests without fail. Therefore a 24 hours scheme would be more suited. These permits should not be used for Bar or restaurant patrons or staff. This could be specific to any zone or Clifton only due to the tourism culture of the area.</p> <p>These guests become resident of Clifton for one or more nights. They help our local economy by using local businesses and creating jobs.</p> <p>The Avon Gorge Hotel understands and supports the need of controlling the amount of cars that come into the city each day but a resident parking scheme should not be implemented to the detriment of our business.</p>	<p>4.3.4 4.6.4</p> <p>4.3.4 4.6.4</p> <p>4.3.4</p> <p>4.3.4</p> <p>3.4 4.3.4</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.3 4.3.4</p>
982		<p>The value of the complex interaction between residents, businesses and retail shops, is a delicate balance which the proposals are in grave danger of destroying. This would result in a loss of jobs in Clifton, as businesses close or relocate, and the loss of livelihood for retailers who even now suffer from the limited parking facilities.</p> <p>The current proposals should either be abandoned completely or changed very significantly to take into account the views and concerns of those who live and work in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>1. 4.1.3 6.</p> <p>2.1 2.2 6.</p>
983		<p>I object to the revised RPS proposal to implement a pay and display only area on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. If introduced, the revised RPS proposal will unreasonably restrict parking solutions for RPS permit purchasing residents by half.</p> <p>This defeats the aim of the scheme which is to improve the position for residents and is not necessary to meet BCC's stated aim of eradicating commuter parking. I urge BCC to reinstate Suspension Bridge Road as a shared pay and display/residents permit scheme in line with the</p>	<p>5.8</p> <p>5.8</p>

		original proposals.	
984		<p>The restriction on parking times to 1 hour will make it impossible for people from outside Clifton to access businesses within the Village.</p> <p>Maintaining the restriction on parking in the Village until 9pm will make it impossible for people from outside Clifton to access leisure facilities in the Village in the evenings.</p> <p>Restricting parking in the Village on Saturdays will accentuate both these kinds of damage.</p> <p>Failing to provide workable provision for employees' parking will further accentuate the damage to business.</p> <p>We were told originally that the scheme was primarily to stop commuters from occupying parking spaces in Clifton during the working day. This is now clearly not the case as commuters will not be there up to 9pm, or on Saturdays.</p> <p>If implemented there is sure to be a serious exodus of businesses from Clifton, and the loss of social facilities which are much valued far beyond the borders of the Village.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.3 4.4</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p>
985		<p>It seems to me that the scheme as currently designed will increase the turnover of parked cars in the village and make it more likely that I will visit local shops rather than parking illegally, dashing into the bank and leaving.</p> <p>It also seems to me that if I want to spend time over a coffee, there are plenty of 2/3 hour pay and display bays within easy walking distance that will allow me to do this.</p> <p>I think the entire 'Clifton will die' campaign is entirely ridiculous – all of their arguments can be easily demolished and it seems to me that this is simply an attempt to make life difficult for the Mayor.</p> <p>I do not understand how the shopkeepers in Clifton Village think they are going to be worse off when in fact the scheme will allow for more rapid turnover and make it much more likely that potential customers can park.</p>	Comments noted
986		<p>The proposed scheme does not provide sufficient parking for people commuting into the area for the day (paid or free). The few permits that are allocated will not be sufficient for me to reasonable expect to be allocated a permit.</p> <p>There are no sufficient bus services from my location (north Bristol) to Clifton Village. My only options are to cycle, walk 35 mins to the 8/9 service in Redland (not really feasible in bad weather) or to catch two buses – one to the City centre and another to Clifton Village or one to Redland and one to Clifton Village (an extremely long and expensive journey when it only takes me 15 minutes to drive).</p>	<p>3.3 4.4 4.3</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p>

	<p>Cannot cycle to work for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no cycle paths along my route whatsoever.</li> <li>• The condition of the roads make it impossible to cycle safely without cycling in the middle of the road, where drivers will make dangerous manoeuvres to pass you. This is not helped by the narrow roads that are along my cycle route.</li> <li>• There are no shower facilities at my work place, and due to the layout of the building, the plumbing and lease agreement, it is not feasible to install one.</li> <li>• There are no secure bike parks in Clifton Village and there is a very real risk of theft of the bike.</li> </ul>	4.6
	<p>Concessions should be made for those who take care to lessen their impact on the environment by driving fuel efficient or electric cars (which are expensive to buy and not a feasible purchase for most.</p>	3.2.2
	<p>We cannot purely recruit our team from within Bristol because of the specialist nature of our work and the skill sets our employees have. This means that our staff need to commute into the Clifton area and need access to their cars to travel to clients during the day. The difficulty that the proposed scheme adds to the commute of our staff will limit our ability to attract and retain them in an extremely competitive market.</p>	4.4 4.3 4.6 4.1.3
	<p>The nearest paid parking for people commuting into the area is a 20 minute walk and we do not believe that it will cope with demands placed on it by commuters coming into Clifton and other areas of the City that are introducing the scheme.</p>	4.3 4.6.4
	<p>The ability to pay for parking for five hours is not practical for employees who are contracted to work 7.5 hours per day and who routinely work more.</p>	4.3 4.6.4
	<p>The number of permits will not be sufficient to meet the parking requirements of our staff. The revised plans seemingly allow for more permits for some businesses depending on varied circumstances but our interpretation of these amended provisions do not give us any comfort that we will be able to obtain any more permits, let alone a sufficient number.</p>	4.3 4.4
	<p>Even if there were enough permits, they would need to be fully transferable between cars as different members of staff are in the office at different times and different days.</p>	4.6
	<p>The proposed extension to the park and ride scheme at Lon Ashton will help some of our commuters coming from south of the City, although we believe that extending a current route rather than introducing a Clifton specific service will lead to an additional commuting time for those staff who could use it.</p>	4.5
	<p>These members of staff routinely already work longer than standard working hours, and this additional time will make their commute untenable, forcing them to look for work elsewhere.</p>	4.3 4.6

	<p>There is no provision for park and ride for commuters coming into the Clifton area from the North, West or East of the city.</p> <p>We do not believe that it is viable on a long term basis for our staff commuting from these areas to use the park and ride into the City centre and then walk/change bus to get into Clifton. This will make working for Mazars extremely unattractive as a proposition for those commuting outside the City.</p> <p>We also consider that the consultation process has been inadequate: the initial consultation did not occur and we understand that the Councillors of Bristol City Council decided to fast track this stage of the process.</p> <p>The informal consultation – whilst we understand this phase took place, it was shorter than planned and appeared to be cut short by a week.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.5 4.3 4.6.4</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>2.1</p>
987	<p>The scheme will have an immediate and detrimental effect on our business, driving people and business out of Clifton Village.</p>	<p>4.1.3 6</p>
988	<p>The current proposals reduce the amount of available resident parking.</p> <p>The introduction of pay and display bays suggests that the residents will be forced to pay both for a parking permit and for pay and display parking on an adhoc basis as there will not be enough resident spaces available.</p> <p>I would also add that it is a condition of my tenancy agreement that no bicycles are kept in the flat or on the premises. The public railings outside the flat are also subject to the come and go of bicycle users, so this precludes the use of a bike.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>1.2</p>
989	<p>More yellow lines in some roads such as Royal York Crescent will make parking even more difficult</p> <p>Removing the present yellow lines in The Paragon would be disastrous. The road is just wide enough for two cars and as it is large vehicles tend to park on the pavements.</p> <p>The extension of the scheme from 9am to 9pm for 6 days will become a nightmare for residents returning after a day's work who will then have to pay again at machines if they are lucky enough to find one.</p> <p>As for what all this will do to local business is debatable. They need to be helped and visitors to the area should be encouraged not hindered.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>3.4</p>
990	<p>The Council has failed to provide viable alternatives for commuters from beyond the city. The Council need to ensure that all new housing had park and ride proposals, to build more car parks, introduce a light rapid transport system and extend bus and local train services. There should be alternatives</p>	<p>4.5</p>

	<p>before the Council starts to impose parking restrictions.</p> <p>People will try to get round the system. The problem will not go away it will only be displaced.</p> <p>This is anti-business. It will make it unattractive to occupy offices other than in the city centre or in business parks on the periphery.</p> <p>There will be an impact on commuters – a half hour drive from Thornbury will become two bus rides and a walk at either end taking twice as long. This has an impact on business through the cost of recruitment and training new staff.</p> <p>Those of us who drive to work as we need our car in the day to go to meetings outside Bristol will have to pay to park when we return to Clifton.</p> <p>Inevitably more gardens will be dug up and converted into car parks to the visual detriment of our city as well as causing increased runoff from impermeable surfaces.</p> <p>It is unfair to pick on commuters. What about parents driving kids to and from school – there is a dramatic difference in traffic volumes and improved parking opportunities during school and university vacations? How are you encouraging parents out of their cars?</p> <p>You need to be providing businesses with more guaranteed parking permits and at a lower cost until you provide viable alternatives for commuters to get to work.</p>	<p>3.8 5.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.4 4.5 4.6</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>4.4 4.5 4.6</p>
991	<p>I am dumbstruck that the Council has proposed these changes at a time of such fragile economic recovery.</p> <p>Patients of my chemist have already told me they will go elsewhere if the parking regime is changed as there are chemists in other areas of Bristol who have unrestricted parking.</p> <p>Independent business is (rather, was) the lifeline of the British economy. If these restrictions go ahead it will certainly make me reconsider the viability of being located in Clifton Village.</p>	<p>1 3.1.2</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>1.3 4.1.3</p>
992	Identical to objection 936	See objection 936
993	<p>I feel as though the new parking restriction proposal was fast tracked and that we were not consulted on the issue.</p> <p>It would be very difficult to continue trading as usual without at least increasing the public transport</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.5</p>

	<p>services to the area.</p> <p>The short parking times will restrict the number of people who visit the village and therefore it will negatively influence trade in the area.</p> <p>The six month review period is potentially too far in the future as small businesses may not survive that long with these restrictions.</p>	<p>4.1.1 4.2</p> <p>6</p>
994	<p>It seems that the plans are being forced through despite high local opposition from both residents and business people, evidenced by the high turnout at both last week's protest and the previous week's business owners'/Clifton BID meeting.</p> <p>Clifton village is a prestigious area that has a unique landscape of high-density residential dwellings (e.g. there are probably on average 10 car drivers per building on my street, but only space for one or two cars outside each house).</p> <p>The commuters that park here mainly work here, unlike other areas where they are commuters to the City Centre.</p> <p>We will be charged for a situation that is much the same. They will in fact make things worse – we will have to pay with less parking.</p> <p>Why should our guests have to pay to visit us?</p> <p>With objections from business owners to the plans, more bays are being turned to time-limited spaces, taking spaces away from residents.</p> <p>Will residents be able to park in front of their garages?</p> <p>I have concerns on behalf of business holders that time limits of 1,2 or even 3 hours are not workable – the reason why Clifton Village is so popular is that people come here to have meal, go for a coffee and then shop.</p> <p>The main business during the week comes from businesses that are based in Clifton Village. If their employees have nowhere to park, then the businesses will need to move elsewhere which will be fatal for Clifton Village.</p> <p>I am really concerned that the council appear not to have completed the analysis required for this type of scheme, have not performed their due consultation and appear to be ignoring the objections to date and are not transparent in their handling of the matter.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>3.3 3.5</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>1.2 3.1.2</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>2.1.2 5.18</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3 4.6 4.1.1</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>

		Bus fares have not been reduced, in reducing the fair from 1.80 to 1.50 but removing the return fair, it now costs £3 for a return trip. This is not a valid positive action from the Council.	4.5
995		Commuter parking is a problem from 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. The proposed hours of operation are damaging to ordinary life and the scheme should be put on hold until a proper implementation plan is produced.	3.4
996		<p>Believes that the scheme is not workable as the plans are flawed and are not based on reasonable analysis. They are being forced through despite local opposition from residents and business people.</p> <p>Clifton Village has a unique landscape and has high-density residential dwellings, commercial operations and small independent traders. Most commuters work there rather than in the city centre. The plans will not benefit residents or traders as they will be charged for a situation that remains the same. In some ways it will be worse as there will be less parking and it will be difficult for friends to visit.</p> <p>Asks whether it will be possible to park on another street if there is no space in Royal York Crescent.</p> <p>Maximum stays of 1, 2 and 3 hours are not enough for businesses. They do not give people enough time to do everything that they would like to do. During the day, most of the parking is caused by the employees and if they have nowhere to park, businesses may relocate.</p> <p>Bus fares have actually gone up because although the single fare has gone from £1.80 to £1.50, the return fare has been removed, so it costs £3 instead of £2.70.</p> <p>Requests a scheme designed to meet everyone's needs based on analysis and data. The plans and objections received to them should be transparent, as should information about how the money will be spent.</p>	<p>1 2.1 2.2</p> <p>1 4.4 3.6</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>1.3 4.2 4.6.4 4.6 4.5</p> <p>1 3.1 2.2</p>
997		<p>The proposals do not take account of people who have no alternative to the car. They make no allowance for the numerous businesses in the area and their employees. They should be able to park in parking areas adjacent to the business.</p> <p>There is not enough consideration of the mix of residents and businesses parking. The proposals are unfairly biased towards residents.</p> <p>Works at Stride Treglown and needs regular access to her car to go to site meetings at short notice. Is office based on other days and needs to park on street for 8 hours. The maximum stay restrictions will prevent her doing her job.</p> <p>Permit numbers are not related to the size of the business. They have over 120 staff but can only</p>	<p>1.1 4.6</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.3 4.6.4 4.1.4</p> <p>4.3</p>

		<p>apply for 7 permits. This is unfair.</p> <p>The maximum stay in nearby pay &amp; display is five hours which will lead to unnecessary moving of vehicles at lunchtime.</p> <p>The impact on business has not been analysed yet the proposals will impact on business viability. There are no planning policies or strategies that state that this proposal is necessary.</p> <p>The proposals are in contravention of paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework. They will not provide convenient parking if business visitors, shoppers and commuters are unable to use it. The lack of space undermines people's ability to use the shops and services in Clifton. There should be a long-stay parking option.</p> <p>There is no statement of community involvement referring to part 1 of this consultation or any statement relating to changes that this has influenced in the proposals. It is unclear what changes were made following previous consultation.</p> <p>Can always find somewhere to park close to work but the proposals will make this extremely difficult. Requests the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A full transport assessment carried out to measure the extent of parking problems</li> <li>2. A review of the mix of visitor, business and residential parking provision.</li> <li>3. Better transport infrastructure, including better P&amp;R routes and additional public transport services.</li> <li>4. A fairer ratio of business permits to employees.</li> <li>5. A phased and considered plan will full consideration given to parking and traffic issues.</li> <li>6. Providing unlimited stay times for cars parked during business hours.</li> <li>7. Parking restrictions should stop at 6pm in all parts of Clifton.</li> </ol> <p>Has reviewed other options but found that cycling is too far and public transport takes too long and is too expensive so the car is the best option. The scheme should make allowance for this.</p> <p>The scheme discriminates against working parents, many of whom are women working part-time. They may not be able to continue work as they face extended commuting time and paying for additional childcare hours. This is not fair.</p>	<p>4.6.4</p> <p>1.1 1.3</p> <p>3.3.2 4.6.4</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.5 4.3 3.4 6 4.2 3.3</p> <p>4.3 4.5 4.6 4.6.4</p> <p>4.3 4.5 4.6 4.6.4</p>
998		<p>The intention was to discourage commuters from using central Bristol as a car park, which should make life easier for the residents who would not have to put up with inconsiderate and dangerous parking. Codrington Place and Belgrave place suffer from such bad parking that cars cannot get round, let alone emergency vehicles.</p>	Noted



		<p>However, this intention seems to have been misinterpreted and the scheme designed to generate the maximum revenue possible, to be as intrusive as possible and to have the greatest possible running costs.</p> <p>The proposal should be abandoned and completely rethought.</p>	<p>3.1 3.2.1</p> <p>Noted</p>
999		Queries whether Royal York Villas can be included in the scheme as it is an un-adopted road. Is strongly opposed to the scheme because it will destroy Clifton's vibrancy, culture and atmosphere.	5.3 1
1000		<p>Works part-time at Litfield House Medical centre. Cannot afford to use pay &amp; display machines and to be moving her car every few hours. Usually parks in residential streets once residents have left for work and leaves before they return home. Residents are aware of the parking situation before they move there. The scheme will destroy the nature of Clifton and stop it being a working Village.</p> <p>The scheme will affect her ability to work as she will have to give up her job.</p> <p>Walking would take 60 minutes each way and would involve walking in the dark during winter, two buses would be needed for the journey to and from work, which would take too long and be too expensive and using the train would still involve a one mile walk.</p>	<p>4.5 4.6 4.3 4.6.4 1.2.2</p> <p>4.3 4.6</p> <p>4.3 4.6</p>
1001		<p>Leigh Woods residents are dependent on Clifton Village as the bye-laws forbid any shops on their side of the Bridge. There is no accessible public transport from their house and they live on a busy main road without a pavement. Cycling is dangerous. Not everyone is fit enough to be able to walk across the Bridge to get to the Village but they are dependent on its facilities.</p> <p>Older people, disabled people, parents with small children and anyone carrying heavy shopping is dependent on being able to drive between Leigh Woods and the Village. The scheme imprisons disabled people in their homes which cannot be fair.</p> <p>Enquires about the Equalities Impact Assessment and whether any mitigating measures have been put in place.</p> <p>The plans will cause everyone in Leigh Woods to drive elsewhere for their shopping. This will create more traffic on the roads. Or people will shop online. They will stop visiting the Village and businesses there will suffer. The Village will become a no-go area as there will be no new shoppers to replace lost custom.</p> <p>They will also need to register with doctors in north Somerset, which will involve travelling farther.</p> <p>Charging for permits discriminates against those least able to afford them.</p>	<p>4.5 1.3</p> <p>4.2.6</p> <p>1</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>3.1.2</p>

		<p>Most people that work in the Village and travel in and out every day will have to give up their jobs as public transport is inadequate. Better alternatives should be available.</p> <p>Requests a proper consultation with traders and residents, including residents of Leigh Woods. More studies need to be carried out before something like this is introduced.</p>	<p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
1002		<p>Parking problems are caused by people driving in from outlying villages and leaving their car in Clifton for the day whilst they take the bus or walk into the city centre to work. These commuters should find alternatives. A scheme operating from Monday to Friday is a good idea.</p> <p>However, parking charges on Saturday may deter people who want to visit the Village as a weekend treat. Many people visit to look at the Bridge, go shopping, stop for coffee etc. Why should they be deterred by parking charges?</p> <p>The plan to charge until 9pm does not make sense. It will affect pubs and restaurants.</p> <p>Parking charges should deter commuter traffic but should not price visitors out of Clifton and shut the community down.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>3.4 4.1.1</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p>
1003		<p>Commutes to work in Aztec West by car which takes 30 minutes compared to public transport which would take 90 minutes.</p> <p>Is unhappy with the scheme as it does not provide enough space for the number of residents' cars in the area. Taking spaces away and making residents pay will cause real problems.</p>	<p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>3.3 3.1.2 3.2.1</p>
1004		<p>There are no parking problems after 6pm when the commuters leave. The scheme will remove commuters so there will be even less of an issue then. The extended hours will provide no benefit and be detrimental to residents. This also applies to Saturdays, when there are no parking problems.</p>	<p>3.4</p>
1005		<p>The scheme will destroy the Village as a prosperous tourist destination because it removes a huge number of existing parking spaces there is no adequate public transport system and no public car park.</p> <p>The approach taken is undemocratic and potentially illegal. There has been no proper consultation.</p>	<p>3.3.2 4.5 4.6.4</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p>
1006		<p>The scheme is unworkable. There has been no systematic attempt to produce a cost benefit analysis of the impact on full or part time workers. There are also no plans to add to park &amp; ride capacity in the near future. These omissions make it not fit for purpose.</p>	<p>4.3 4.5 4.6</p>
1007		<p>The dramatic reduction in the number of available spaces will be catastrophic for local residents. Appreciates that some reduction should be possible as the scheme is designed to reduce the number of cars parked in the area but the proposal halves the parking space available in some</p>	<p>3.3</p>

	<p>roads.</p> <p>There is only just enough parking to accommodate local residents overnight and on Sundays. It is likely that non-residents are only a small percentage of parked cars so the reduction in available space means that there will not be enough room for everyone.</p> <p>If the available space remained as it is now, permits would be fantastic for local residents and businesses but the current plans will be hugely damaging.</p>	<p>3.3</p> <p>3.3</p>
1008	<p>Now that lines are in place, she cannot park outside her house. The scheme is not benefitting residents.</p> <p>Very concerned for traders in the Village as they rely on visitors.</p>	<p>5.2</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p>
1009	<p>Opposes the whole proposal. T has not been thought out, as was demonstrated by the removal of 8 other planned zones. Work on some measures has begun before the consultation has been completed.</p> <p>It is possible to park in Victoria Square if the driver is prepared to wait for 5-10 minutes.</p>	<p>2.2.3</p> <p>1.2.2</p>
1010	<p>The plans are flawed and not fit for purpose. There are far fewer parking spaces in CH than previously, mainly due to excessive double yellow lines. In addition, people will no longer be able to park across their driveway or allow friends or neighbours to do so. People will convert their gardens to parking spaces, each time removing an on-street space. This will make parking worse.</p> <p>The scheme cannot solve night-time or evening parking problems as there are too many cars in the streets.</p> <p>Does not want to pay charges for friends, family, builders etc, or for customers of local businesses, or annual charges for residents to park during the daytime in streets that are currently empty.</p> <p>The scheme carries a large administrative cost and increases unsightly street signs, markings and furniture.</p> <p>Commuter parking problems can be solved by providing incentives for car-sharing, park &amp; rides, improving cycling facilities, improving public transport services and costs and creating schemes that penalise people from driving into the city but which do not penalise residents.</p>	<p>5.2</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.1 3.2.1 3.6</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>1 4.5</p>
1011	<p>Has lived in London and believes that schemes there have done irreversible damage to some areas. The schemes result in less passing trade to shops and vacant properties being taken over by chains or remaining empty. Once introduced the damage cannot be undone.</p>	<p>1.3 4.1.3 6</p>
1012	<p>Lives in Nailsea and commutes by car, which takes 20-40 minutes,. There will not be sufficient parking on the Downs for everyone that drives to work in Clifton and it is not safe during the dark.</p>	<p>4.3 4.5</p>

	<p>Catching public transport takes at least an hour longer than driving. There will not be enough space at the Long Ashton park &amp; ride for everyone and it would also take too long.</p> <p>Visits Clifton regularly to shop or eat out. They will not do this with the scheme in place so local businesses and restaurants will suffer. Clifton Village will die.</p>	<p>4.6</p> <p>1.3 4.1.1</p>
1013	<p>The plans are flawed and significant changes are required. There has not been consultation with local residents, businesses and traders. Clifton Village is unique and needs a unique solution.</p> <p>Park &amp; Ride is required on both sides of the Suspension Bridge. This would solve the problem and should be prioritised.</p> <p>Has lived in Clifton for 8 years and can always park so believes that the present system works. This is why people think that the scheme is designed to make money. It will kill of the shops and businesses.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1 3.1.1</p>
1014	<p>The plans are flawed and need to be changed. Works in Clifton and is required to drive to work for safety reasons. She will have to take a pay cut to continue working and that is only if the company can purchase a permit for her. It may not be possible to find a space due to the one hour parking near her workplace and the business may not survive due to the number of clients that need to visit for longer than one hour.</p>	<p>4.2 4.3 4.6 3.3.2</p>
1015	<p>Has lived in Clifton for 8 years with no parking problems. It is not clear what the scheme will mean for the area. Assumes that existing bays will be retained but would like the surrounding private roads/kerbs to be unmarked. This is essential for people to park close to their flat. It is not public highway so should not be subject to the scheme.</p>	<p>5.2</p>
1016	<p>Parking restrictions in Cecil Road and College Fields are unnecessary. Many union meetings are held at the promenade but there is always space for their cars. Weekend visitors to the Downs and the Suspension Bridge should be encouraged and should not have to pay.</p>	<p>3.4 1.2</p>
1017	<p>The plans are not fit for purpose and require significant changes before they will work.</p> <p>The one hour maximum stay will have a devastating impact on traders as customer feedback has found that at least two hours is required.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>4.2</p>
1018	<p>The scheme is unworkable and greater consideration needs to be given to visitor parking. The one hour maximum stay will directly result in loss of trade and will have a negative effect on local business.</p>	<p>4.2 4.1.1</p>
1019	<p>Object to the proposed pay &amp; display only on the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. There are 65 residential dwellings, one public house and one accountancy firm and only 57 spaces available. The proposal will unreasonably restrict the number of spaces available to residents and businesses by half. This defeats the aim of the scheme and is not necessary to meet the aim of removing commuter parking.</p>	<p>5.8</p>

1020	<p>The scheme will destroy the unique atmosphere of Clifton and will have an impact on her ability to socialise with friends. If people cannot park they will not visit and the businesses will not survive. The unique character of Clifton will be lost.</p> <p>She will be unable to meet friends there. Limiting people to one visitor a week will affect residents' ability to socialise. People will no longer want to live in Bristol because they cannot work once businesses are driven out and cannot meet their friends.</p>	<p>1.2 1.3 3.6</p> <p>1.2 4.1.3 3.6</p>
1021	Identical to objection 1019.	5.8
1022	<p>Has been trading in Clifton Village for 19 years. The plans will drastically affect their business.</p> <p>At least 50% of their customers are from surrounding areas of Bristol and even farther afield than Bristol, having made a special trip to Clifton Village. They clearly need longer than two hours; some make purchases then collect them much later in the day.</p> <p>The plans will kill the atmosphere of the Village as visitors will be clock watching and will not enjoy their day.</p> <p>Deliveries will be very difficult with pay &amp; display provision outside the shop. Some of the boxes weigh 20-25kg. This means that they will have to pay for permits and for pay &amp; display to enable loading/unloading.</p> <p>One hour should be increased to at least two hours. People will not stay longer than they need to if they are paying and it would be good for them to have the option of staying longer.</p>	<p>1.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.2</p>
1023	<p>The number of permits issued to schools and businesses will not be enough to meet their needs. Residents who have bought permits will have no guarantee of a place to park. Clifton Village traders will lose custom to areas without restrictions.</p> <p>Commuter parking is detrimental but the council has a duty to cater for it in order to act in the best interest of the city.</p>	<p>4.3 3.3 4.1</p> <p>1</p>
1024	Works at Bristol Zoo Gardens and would have to resign if she cannot drive in and park nearby. She car shares with two other employees so is contributing towards reducing traffic. Public transport is insufficient to get her from Backwell and has to drop her daughter off at nursery too so cannot get two buses with her. The scheme will mean many employees and visitors will suffer for very little gain.	<p>4.3 4.5 4.6</p>
1025	Writing on behalf of himself and his team. They believe that the proposal will be detrimental to BZG and other businesses. Visitor numbers will inevitably fall.	<p>1.3 4.1.1</p>

		<p>Public transport is not sufficient to cater for getting to work and dropping off children at nursery. The city does not have the required transport infrastructure to support the scheme.</p> <p>The pay display bays are limited to five hours so they cannot use those. There is no information about the cost and flexibility of the park &amp; ride service.</p> <p>Questions what the predicted impact of the scheme on local business is and why it was proposed.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>4.5.2 4.5.3 4.6.4</p> <p>1.1 1.3 4.1.3</p>
1026		<p>The scheme is not workable as the revised plans are flawed. It needs to be reconsidered.</p> <p>It will threaten the viability of the Village. It should not operate on Saturdays or until 9pm.</p> <p>Businesses make a big contribution to Bristol's success and they should be helped to create jobs and pay business rates. Residents also pay very high taxes and should not have to pay this additional tax.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>1.1 3.1.2 3.2.1</p>
1027		<p>Supports a residents' parking zone.</p> <p>There should not be any parking spaces restricted to one hour they should be at least two hours.</p> <p>Princes Buildings residents will need to be able to park in the ay &amp; display only bays otherwise there will not be enough room. This is unreasonable. The original proposal of shared use parking was better than the advertised plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.3</p>
1028		<p>Previous schemes have been rejected. This one is being imposed and is not democratic.</p> <p>There is no evidence that any surveys have been conducted about who comes into the city by car to work and who parks where and when. Residents have not been asked where they park their car and when. The Council cannot be sure that sufficient on-street parking is available.</p> <p>If visitors and customers have not been surveyed the Council cannot be certain that the proposals will not adversely affect them.</p> <p>Requests evidence that existing schemes are popular and those attitudes had changed once they were introduced.</p> <p>The additional charge should not be imposed as residents already pay for a road-fund licence, fuel duty and VAT. If the payment is for white lines and bureaucracy then it is a waste of his resources.</p>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>1 3.3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3.1.1 3.2.1</p>

		<p>Enquires whether the rate would be fixed or whether it would increase and whether the increase would be capped. It is unclear whether refunds will be given if a permit is not required for a whole year.</p> <p>There will be limits on where residents can park and spaces will not be guaranteed. The Clifton zone is one of the smallest and it will be particularly difficult for residents to park close to their home. There will be additional costs and inconvenience for everyone. There should be a Clifton-wide scheme instead.</p> <p>It is unlikely that air quality improvements will be realised. Drivers will spend more time and fuel trying to find a space.</p> <p>The pay &amp; display machines are not appropriate for the conservation area and as the pavements are very narrow in places, the machines could prove restrictive for pedestrians and road users.</p> <p>Bristol needs a comprehensive integrated public transport system. Without this, the car will be the most convenient transport option for the majority of people. It would benefit everyone if more parking spaces were provided to attract more visitors and customers.</p>	<p>3.1.1 3.2.1</p> <p>3.3 5.2</p> <p>1.2 3.1.2</p> <p>4.1.5</p> <p>4.5</p>
1029		<p>The plans are fundamentally wrong as they will destroy the area they aim to protect.</p> <p>Clifton Village has a moderately high number of businesses, many of which are not connected to the tourist market. Many may leave the area. There is only very limited and extremely slow public transport services to the area and the proposed 505 makes very little difference.</p> <p>Has heard from those that drive to work in the area that most parking spaces are shared through the day, with workers arriving as residents leave. Car-owning residents are as responsible for the car saturation in the Village as commuters. No group should not be penalised for the convenience of the other.</p> <p>Proposes that the same number of parking spaces be provided as are there now but that there is a charge for them. Residents' permits should be available at their current prices and others should pay £5-£10 for a day pass.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1.3 4.5</p> <p>1.1 3.3</p> <p>3.3 3.2.1</p>
1030		<p>One hour parking in the Village will cause significant loss of trade for many businesses. There are inadequate transport links into the Village. Business permits are inadequate for working traders and do not guarantee a space.</p>	<p>4.2 4.3 4.5 3.3</p>
1031		<p>The scheme will have a detrimental impact on his practice and on patients and staff.</p>	<p>1.3</p>

		<p>Their small car park is often full so many patients and all of his members of staff park in the adjacent roads. There is no car park within a reasonable distance and no park and ride scheme. The practice carries out specialised procedures and treats patients travelling from far afield, for whom travelling on public transport is unreasonable. Where patients need to be sedated they cannot travel home by public transport. The limited space allocated and time allowed for parking under the proposals is insufficient for many patients.</p> <p>Due to the specialised techniques used at the centre, many staff members travel from outside Bristol. There is no effective integrated public transport system for them to use. They will have to seek work elsewhere, which means that they will not be using all of their skills and that it will not be possible to replace them with local staff. Many patients have indicated that they will be unwilling to come to Litfield for treatment if they cannot park.</p> <p>Transporting heavy equipment and files by public transport is not practical.</p> <p>Understands that only the business that pays business rates has a permit entitlement. His practice leases rooms from Litfield House Medical Centre but is an entirely separate business. The number of permits available to Litfield House is completely impractical.</p>	<p>4.6.4 4.5 4.2</p> <p>4.3 4.5 4.6</p> <p>3.7 4.3</p> <p>4.3 3.7</p>
1032		Completely supports the scheme. It is now much easier to park in Cotham than it used to be because the pay & display means that there are spaces available. Would never attempt to drive to Clifton as it is impossible to find somewhere. It should be emphasised that there will be spaces for shoppers to use.	Comments noted
1033		The scheme is not workable as the plans are flawed. Parking charges will drive shoppers away and severely affect businesses. It is too expensive for residents as well.	3.2 4.1
1034		<p>There appears little or no baseline evidence with which to assess the actual scale of the current issues facing access, movement and parking in and around Clifton.</p> <p>In hearing the views of local Clifton retailer and businesses, many of which are supported by our employees, there remains a risk that insufficient evidence has been collected to test likely retail impact on the vitality and viability of Clifton Village (as a whole) as a local retail destination.</p> <p>In our opinion, evidence is needed to assess the Economic, Social and Environment baseline position in the area in advance of setting out to implement, in this case, a parking strategy. There is no formal strategic development or other plan policy which would justify the magnitude of the change and reaction now proposed by the City Council.</p> <p>It is not clear to what degree congestion has been and is continued to be measured and found to be</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1 4.1.3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>



	<p>a problem in the area and, therefore, justifying the scale and perceived impact of the parking proposal response.</p> <p>Not clear whether public transport accessibility is capable of dealing with current and projected movements generated by local residents and businesses as a result of the parking proposals.</p> <p>Not clear whether parking permits, as outlined in the draft TRO's are capable of being used: if full take up of business permit applications is achieved, what would the effect on available car parking bays in the area.</p> <p>A strategic infrastructure funding gap exists to address known local access and movement concerns, and the potential for revenue generated by the parking proposals to be targeted towards reasonable, viable and attractive solutions to the base problems (if so defined).</p> <p>Not clear whether the outcome of earlier comments, in the form of an accompanying Statement of Community Involvement in line with adopted Council policies (and Local Development Scheme), have been considered and used to inform the changes made in the recent TROs.</p> <p>Local businesses employ highly talented staff who reside outside the City Region (or region) and who commute on a daily basis and therefore are restricted in terms of their available commuting modes.</p> <p>The decision to fast track initial consultation prior to September 2013 was a constructive step and whether further consultation and engagement with business and residents is required to resolve a number of significant concerns.</p> <p>The risk at present is that both the strategy appears flawed and the delivery of the scheme has not been sufficiently considered.</p> <p>Many of our employees are professionals who work across the county and need to regularly attend meetings and visit construction sites. These meetings are in locations where existing public transport links are poor, meaning it is necessary to drive to site. Visits to site meetings can often be short notice, for this reason having immediate access to a car outside the office for our employees is essential.</p> <p>We would be entitled to a maximum of 7 permits for business and customer use. This would not be sufficient to cater for the number of visitors attending our premises each day.</p> <p>We can envisage a situation where spaces would be taken on a first come first served basis which would not be conducive to organisations like our own who may wish to reserve permits for visitors during the length of the working day.</p>	<p>4.5</p> <p>3.3 4.4 3.5</p> <p>4.5 3.1</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>4.3 4.6 4.5</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>1 6</p> <p>4.3 4.1.4</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>3.3 4.3</p>
--	--	---

	<p>With local parking restricted to 5 hours, it would become extremely hard for us to host all day meetings. This will detrimentally affect our ability to carry out business. It is unreasonable to expect all visitors to travel in this manner, especially as many will be traveling from areas where bus and rail links are not conducive to timely arrival and departure.</p>	<p>4.2 4.6.4 4.5</p>
	<p>We would request that most local pay and display parking within this area be operated on an unrestricted duration basis within working hours. This will give us the flexibility to manage our business without undue restrictions.</p>	<p>4.1 4.1.3</p>
	<p>We strongly recommend that the Council should consider allocating the number of permits entitled to a business in a proportionate amount, taking into account: the number of employees working at the premises, the number of visitors over a typical day/week and the characteristics of the specific location: there being very few residential properties affected our parking needs in the area.</p>	<p>4.3</p>
	<p>The general approach in the area to the north of Clifton Down Road appears to have been to allocate residents' parking immediately outside all residential dwellings, leaving all other road space restricted to pay and display/residents' parking. In this area, we contend that this provision is imbalanced unduly in favour of residents. The allocation of parking areas available to residents should be reviewed in line with population figures, not residential frontages.</p>	<p>3.3</p>
	<p>The balance of business and residential accommodation means that many residents vacate road space to leave for work elsewhere, just as our employees arrive at work. Our phased operation start times support this approach, distributing travel and parking demand over a 3 hour morning 07:00 to 10:00 and evening 16:00 to 19:00 period.</p>	<p>1.2 3.4.4 3.45</p>
	<p>Even on busy days, it is possible to find a parking space on most streets. To us, this indicates that demand for daytime parking by residents is not such that a space can never be found.</p>	<p>1.2.2</p>
	<p>Areas we suggest should be reclassified away from solely residents' parking include the north and east side of Camp Road (between Percival Road and Norland Road) and the east side of Clifton Down Road (north of the junction with Cecil Road).</p>	<p>3.3</p>
	<p>The multiple and convenient network of bus and rail connections serving the City centre do not extend to Clifton. For the large majority of our employees to use either public transport or park and ride services will therefore involve at least on change and inefficient, time consuming and expensive journeys.</p>	<p>4.5 4.6</p>
	<p>Whilst the potential introduction of a Long Ashton Park and Ride to Clifton service is a constructive move, this is not considered the panacea to Clifton's public transport accessibility problems and would only realistically aid those travelling from the south and south west of the City.</p>	<p>4.5</p>

		<p>Whilst there are a number of conveniently located all day public car parks serving the city centre, there are none in Clifton Village or in Clifton Village North. The introduction of the RPS will leave no all day public parking within over half a mile of our offices. It is not reasonable to expect people working in Clifton, who regularly need the use of their car to carry out their day to day work, to have to walk over half a mile from the nearest all day public car park to reach their place of work.</p> <p>We recommend that the time and payment restrictions are lifted on Fountains Well Road, Ladies Mile and the Circular Downs Road. This will free up a considerable number of parking spaces within a reasonable walking distance of many businesses. This would enable our staff and business to maintain relatively easy access to personal transport in a location away from residents.</p> <p>Many of our employees would consider seeking alternative employment if the introduction of the Residents' Parking Scheme adversely affected their travel arrangements.</p> <p>We remain open to the prospect of relocation our practice headquarters away from the parking zone in order to reduce the impact on our staff, and therefore our business. If we were to relocate, the attractiveness of our premises in a tightly controlled parking regime would be significantly reduced.</p>	<p>4.6.4 4.1.4 4.3</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>4.1.3 4.6</p> <p>4.1.3 6</p>
1035		<p>Does not have problems parking close to her flat so does not want to pay when there will be no guarantee of a space.</p> <p>Very concerned about visitor parking. Her partner visits 3 or 4 times a week and will not be able to park. Restrictions from 9am to 9pm are unreasonable.</p> <p>This is not democratic as most people are against the plans. This and the increased toll on the Suspension Bridge are enough to drive people away from living in Clifton.</p>	<p>3.3.1</p> <p>3.4 3.6</p> <p>1.2 2.1 2.2</p>
1036		<p>The scheme will be detrimental to the vibrancy of Clifton Village and the surrounding area. Limiting parking to one hour will mean that visitors will only have time to walk across the Suspension Bridge and back and will not have time to visit the independent shops, cafes and businesses. Staff will not be able to park unless the business can afford to invest in permits. These businesses will not survive and Clifton will be full of chain convenience stores.</p> <p>Parking restrictions should stop at 5 or 6pm and not 9pm as this will restrict their ability to have visitors. The continuation to 9pm will not benefit local residents or local restaurants.</p>	<p>1.3 4.2 4.3</p> <p>3.4</p>
1037		<p>Objects to the pay &amp; display only proposed for the north side of Suspension Bridge Road. It halves the space available to residents. It defeats the aims of the scheme and is not necessary to eradicate commuter parking.</p>	5.8
1038		<p>Concerns in addition to those of her employer (see objection 781). Her concerns are:</p>	

	<p>The scheme does not provide sufficient parking for people commuting to the area, either paid or free.</p> <p>There are no sufficient bus services from her home in Bradley Stoke to her place of work.</p> <p>The park &amp; ride at long Ashton is pointless as she would virtually pass the office to get to it. Might consider using one from Portway if provided.</p>	<p>3.3.2</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.5.3</p>
1039	<p>On many occasions I have not been able to find a parking space and have driven around and around the village before moving on to Whiteladies road to shop. The result is increased congestion and pollution in Clifton Village and the loss of trade for the businesses. The parking proposal as it currently stands will only exacerbate the situation and result in the closure of many small businesses.</p> <p>The cosmopolitan character of the village will be lost and all that will remain will be the major supermarkets and a couple of pubs.</p>	<p>1.3 4.1.1 4.1.3</p> <p>1.3</p>
1040	<p>Sir John Betjeman described it as 'the finest suburb in England' and rated Bristol's architecture above that of Bath. It is very unlikely, that an enlightened and reputable architect would approve of covering Clifton's streets with yellow lines and erecting unsightly parking ticket machines in this conservation area – which hitherto the City Council has guarded with much care.</p> <p>It is certain that Clifton has a car parking problem and the Mayor is to be congratulated for addressing this issue. Unfortunately, his enthusiasm has doubtless clouded his vision and judgement and he appears to be trying to force a scheme on residents, traders and visitors in an autocratic manner.</p> <p>The cost of the exercise to date must be excessive and should be curtailed.</p> <p>Along every road in Clifton as appropriate i.e. avoiding corners, lowered kerbs, narrow roads paint a narrow three inch strip three feet long at right angles to the kerb, placing these at intervals for one average car length. Allow residents to purchase permits with more reasonable charges. All other spaces i.e. the majority can then be used by non-permit holders but for a maximum of 2 hours only from 8 am to 6pm Monday to Friday. Such a scheme will allow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traders to park and their customers to shop.</li> <li>• Residents to park and their visitors to visit.</li> <li>• Clifton to retain its 'conservation' appearance.</li> <li>• A workable solution to Clifton's parking log jam including the commuter problem.</li> <li>• A scheme acceptable to the majority (democracy over autocracy).</li> <li>• The avoidance of criminal activity which machines containing much cash will 'encourage'.</li> </ul>	<p>4.1.5</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>Noted 3.3</p>
1041	<p>The council closed off Boyces Avenue and pedestrianized it then closed us off to Kings Road, making deliveries extremely difficult. These changes have been a huge blow to our shop on Boyces Avenue as we rely heavily on donations being brought to our shop.</p>	<p>1.3</p>

		I think that quite a few shopkeepers will be considering coming out once their lease expires.	1.3
		There are days when Clifton is like a ghost town, when you've got an army of traffic wardens booking anything that doesn't move, how can you even think that what you are proposing is going to change it for the good?	1.2 1.3 1.4
1042		The scheme is not workable in its current state and revised plans are flawed. So far as I am aware no consultations have been made with businesses in the area.	2.1 2.1.3
1043		<p>We regard the traders of Clifton as crucial members of our community providing services to our area. Their businesses rely on the trade of visitors and of those who work in the offices to keep going. Their existence provides essential services to local residents. Businesses will leave the area if they have restrictive parking.</p> <p>The traders feel vulnerable and regard the consultation process as inadequate. The initial consultation period did not occur and the informal consultation was cut short by a week.</p> <p>You cannot compare for example Cotham with Clifton Village. The needs of each area are very different.</p> <p>The public transport system to Clifton is inadequate and the fact that we do not have a car park makes parking in the streets inevitable.</p> <p>The new park and ride scheme to Clifton is a start but insufficient and does not assist those from other areas.</p> <p>We have evidence from Swindon when parking charges were introduced in the centre and then subsequently revoked due to the deleterious effect the charges had on the local economy.</p> <p>A green city? It seems an oxymoron when it will mean introducing ugly street furniture and daubing our streets with pain for parking bays and double yellow lines.</p> <p>I am going to have to pay to park my car on the street as well as paying my council tax?</p>	1.3 4  2.1  2.1 2.2  4.5 4.6.4  4.5 4.5.3  1.3  4.1.5 1.1  3.1
1044		<p>The order (Part IV) provides for issuing the same number of Visitor Parking Permits to residents of streets where RPS will operate from Monday to Saturday and from 9am to 9pm inclusive and residents of streets where operational times will be Monday to Friday and 9am to 5pm. In order for the scheme to be made equitable, residents in those streets where the scheme will operate for 50% longer each day and for 6 rather than 5 days per week should be entitled to correspondingly more visitor permits.</p> <p>Up to 120 visitor permits per annum will prove inadequate for many residents. Evenings and</p>	3.6  3.6.2



		<p>There is no suitable car park within walking distance of the House, and maximum period of parking of 2-3 hours at a cost per hour is not enough time for many patients and too expensive for staff and patients on limited funds. Many consultants are at the house for 8 hours a day, and will be unable to come out during consultation and/or while operating or administering treatments to move their cars.</p> <p>No consideration at all has been made to accommodate meter parking for our patients or long term parking permits for our staff. In fact, it appears that in addition to permit parking, you intend to place yellow lines on the roads as well. This is unfair, unjust, unnecessary and unrealistic for the businesses of Clifton.</p> <p>The number of permits offered to Litfield House is completely inadequate for the nature of our business. If all of our registered professionals can apply for a parking permit that will help.</p> <p>Based on the details of the scheme I estimate that there will still be inadequate parking for staff and I anticipate that this will affect the viability of our business.</p> <p>There are locations near to where I live that are similarly affected. However there is a real shift towards localism and a real improvement in public transport it is premature, ignorant and damaging to our business to suggest that we can somehow accommodate these restrictions without significant negative impact on our viability.</p>	<p>4.6.4 4.2.1 3.7</p> <p>4.2.1 4.3</p> <p>4.3 3.7</p> <p>4.3 4.6</p> <p>1.3 4.5 6</p>
1048		<p>I am a resident of Clifton Vale Close and do not see that the RPS is needed in what is effectively a cul-de-sac which is only used by residents and visitors. There are currently no problems with parking but the proposals for parking under the scheme will cause problems, as there will be less space than there is now, forcing people onto Clifton Vale, which will itself have less parking than it currently does.</p> <p>It is clear that residents of the city are being made to pay dearly for a problem that is caused by commuters.</p> <p>The provision of a certain number of visitor permits per year makes the whole idea of visiting a much more formal affair; and it looks like any of the other parking bays will have a two hour limit on them.</p> <p>This limitation of free access will impact on people visiting the elderly, or taking children to visit family, home care workers etc.</p> <p>I am self-employed, working from home as a therapist. There are huge numbers of people in private practice, like me, relying on accessibility to make our living. This scheme will make it more difficult for visitors to our homes.</p> <p>Given that the bulk of congestion is caused by commuters from out of town parking their cars in central areas of the city, why are residents paying for the scheme?</p>	<p>5.2</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.6.1</p> <p>3.6.1 3.7</p> <p>3.6.1</p> <p>3.1 3.1.2</p>

		<p>A congestion charge or provision of more, and cheaper, car parks would address the above point.</p> <p>A zoned residents' parking scheme does nothing to make the inner city more accessible to its residents, in fact it makes it more difficult to move across the city from area to area.</p> <p>Bristol, unlike most other major cities, does not have a clear city centre, and its infrastructure does not easily join up the different central areas. There is no easy way to travel on public transport from Hotwells to Gloucester Road or Easton without making one journey into the centre.</p> <p>Public transport in this city is woefully inadequate. It is extremely expensive, unreliable and very often drivers are rude or won't give change. Journey times by bus make this option unrealistic for most people.</p> <p>The RPS will make the daily life of many people much more difficult and women and the elderly in particular will be penalised. It is women who are mainly carrying young children and push chairs and need the convenience of accessibility; it is also women who are most at risk at night and need to park close to their homes.</p> <p>I would favour the idea of a generalised City centre parking permit, allowing people to travel freely from zone to zone, rather than sectioning off each individual area.</p>	<p>1.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>1.2 1.4</p> <p>5.2</p>
1049		<p>The current scheme proposes extended operating hours of 9am to 9pm. We do not experience problems parking after approximately 6pm when commuters parking in this area depart. Clearly with the scheme in place, there will be no commuters parking and so is even less likely to be an issue. The extended hours will not provide any benefit but will detrimental to local residents.</p> <p>The current scheme proposes Monday to Saturday. We do not experience any problems parking on Saturdays as the main additional cars within the local area are related to commuters. We feel that operating the parking zone on a Saturday will be detrimental to the Clifton Village area and residents without providing any significant benefits.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.4.3</p> <p>3.4</p>
1050		<p>I am disturbed by the proposals for parking permits, but especially the proposed additional restrictions from 9am to 9pm. I hold fortnightly day time meetings at my flat but also 2-3 evening meetings each week. It will be impossible for me to continue to hold these meetings if the restrictions continue beyond 6pm, even if more vouchers were available.</p> <p>It will be hard to sell a flat with these restrictions in place, as who would want to live in such an area where visits from their friends and families would be so restricted.</p> <p>I do not understand why we cannot be as other parts of Clifton, i.e. 9am-5pm.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>1.2 1.4 3.6</p> <p>3.4.3</p>



1051	<p>Objects to the plans. Has a business in the area and understand how parking is important for both businesses and residents. Parking is already a problem and the parking is going to get worse. Life expectancy is longer so there are more cars. Parking metres are not going to solve the fundamental problem.</p> <p>The suspension bridge is a massive tourist attraction but there is no visitor car park.</p> <p>Need a park and ride or somewhere where traders can park. Build a car park under the green like they do in London.</p> <p>Inadequate public transport links for visitors and employees.</p> <p>The current plans are not workable and need significant changes before they can be delivered.</p> <p>The one hour parking will result in a loss of trade. Some customers spend four hours in the store.</p> <p>The property prices will not reflect the lovely village because there will be no village.</p>	<p>1.1 1.3 1.4</p> <p>4.6.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>4.1 4.2</p> <p>1.2 1.4</p>
1052	<p>Objects to the scheme because apparently post cards were posted to all addresses in September to inform them of the informal consultation but I never received one.</p> <p>The scheme claims it will make it easier for local residents' and businesses to park but it has not taken into account of cars already in the area owned by residents'. Many houses have been split into different flats etc.</p> <p>One hour maximum stay is too short. You need more time than that to visit the village properly. The shops and restaurants are what make the village a nice place to live.</p> <p>9pm is way too late for a finishing time. It should be 6pm, more in line with the other areas.</p> <p>Permits in Clifton should not be any more expensive than in other areas. The scheme will not cost more to run. Should not think that everyone living in Clifton is wealthier.</p> <p>The bus services that serve the village are inadequate. They are not frequent enough for commuters and they are expensive. Improvements to public transport need to be made in conjunction with measures to reduce car use, not afterwards.</p> <p>Understands how RPS can be positive in some areas but these proposals are ill considered and</p>	<p>2 2.1.2</p> <p>3.5 3.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>3.4 3.4.3</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>2.1</p>

		unsuitable for the area.	2.2
1053		Objects to the installation of one hour parking in the area because it will have a serious detrimental effect on the area.	1.3 4.2
		Often visits the cafes, shops and hairdressers in the area and will no longer be able to do so if cannot park for more than one hour.	4.2
1054		Has had a business in the village since 1987 and strongly objects to these proposals.	Noted
		The plans are not fit for purpose and require significant change before they become viable.	Noted
		There is no car park in Clifton Village for businesses and customers so by limiting the parking and charging for it people will just go to Cribbs Causeway where they have free unlimited parking.	1.3 4.6.4
		There are very bad public transport links to the village.	4.5
		Not enough business permits are available. Many staff have to drive a long way from outside the area where other options are not viable.	4.3 4.6
		One hour is not enough for people to enjoy the shops and visit the cafes.	4.2
		Why are restrictions until 9pm? This is later than anywhere else in Bristol and will further damage the restaurants and bars.	3.4 3.4.3
		A six month review is completely unviable. Businesses are already very fragile and will have been forced to close in this time. The council should be doing everything in its powers to protect businesses and the business community. It is the larger offices around the area who support the shops and cafes.	6 1.3
		The plans must be put on hold so something more suitable can be found to protect the unique character of the village.	2
1055		Objects to the proposed scheme because it is unworkable in its current state as the revised plans are flawed. The plans are not fit for purpose and significant change is required before they will work.	Noted
		Not very many bus services. If you are coming from another part of town you will have to get two or more buses. Peoples work like balance will be affected.	4.5 4.6
		Bristol will lose big businesses which base themselves in Bristol such as RDF, BBC, Films @ 59, Big Bang.	1.2 4

		Students should be banned from bringing their cars to Bristol. They leave them for weeks at a time.	3.3 3.5
1056		<p>Objects to the scheme because the general opinion is that everyone is against it and the mayor is bullying people.</p> <p>Parking would not be a problem if the council invested in the right infrastructure years ago. Cribbs Causeway works because of proper planning.</p> <p>One hour parking spaces are not enough to maintain business. Is a single parent household and relies on income of shop in the village.</p>	2.1 2.2  4.5  1.3 4.1 4.2
1057		<p>I believe such a scheme will impact greatly on local businesses in a hugely negative way, dissuading present shoppers from visiting our area.</p> <p>I also believe the scheme will have a significant social impact on locals because friends and relatives will be dissuaded from visiting because of the extra inconvenience. Cost and risk of penalties. This will be most acutely felt by the elderly and physically disabled.</p> <p>Please stop this obvious revenue generating exercise and keep Clifton special.</p>	1.3 4.1.1  3.6 3.7 4.2.6  3.1.1
1058		<p>I live in Caledonia Place and I am fed up with driving around all day looking for a parking space. 17:30 I have my pick of spaces, so where do they all go – home after parking in Clifton and walking to work nearby?</p>	1.2 3.3
1059		<p>The imposed scheme means that for my working day of 8.5 hours, I would have to pay £9 a day to park in pay and display bays around the area of the zoo. However as the bays only allow a maximum stay of 5 hours with no return within 2 hours this means I would have to leave work in order to move my car. As you can appreciate this is a very unrealistic this is a very unrealistic way to go about a working day especially when I work on a very tight schedule.</p> <p>My other alternative is to get a public transport. I live in Portishead so my only option is to get a bus. This is very expensive and this bus doesn't get me close to my workplace. My other option is to get the bus into the centre of town and another bus up to the zoo. These are very unrealistic options for me to travel to work as it increases my time commuting by a huge amount if I am to use public transport. If I continue to drive the parking charges will cost me huge amounts of money as will public transport which I am not able to afford.</p> <p>A large proportion of our volunteers are unemployed or students which means they will not be able to pay for the parking when they come in, resulting in us losing a large proportion of our workforce. Even those volunteers who can afford to pay for the parking may stop volunteering as obviously we do not pay them to come here and they would lose their incentive to come here.</p>	4.1 4.2    4.5 4.6   4.5 4.6

		Our car parks only hold a certain number of cars, forcing the rest of the visitors to park on the roads. This will encourage less people to come as they will have to pay large parking costs on top of the entrance price to the zoo.	4.1
1060		<p>The current arrangements work well – day time visitors replace those who take their cars to work and space on the road is well used. This benefits Clifton economically.</p> <p>Preventing local business employees from bringing a car to work will cause many to resign and soon their employers will relocate to areas where they can provide parking.</p> <p>Pre-paid parking also discourages casual visitors who will refrain from shopping in an area where there is a chance they will get a ticket or clamped.</p> <p>The Council killed Broadmead by removing parking – Please reconsider before Clifton is destroyed too. We want a village, not a cityscape covered with yellow lines and parking attendants.</p>	<p>3.3 1</p> <p>1.3 4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>Noted</p>
1061		<p>The proposal to have a residents parking scheme operating until 9pm and on Saturdays is sensible in the view of the location close to the night life.</p> <p>We should be given greater quantity of visitor permits than other areas that have free parking after 6pm and on Saturdays.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>3.6</p>
1062		<p>The proposed restrictions for my street are 9-9 Mon-Sat differing from other streets around the area, where restrictions are 9-5 Mon-Fri. This seems particularly unreasonable.</p> <p>I often have visitors that are unable to walk a great distance. Proving very difficult for them when they are forced to park further away.</p> <p>As only a certain proportion of the streets are going to be allocated to permit holders, i.e. some being pay and display or zero parking zones. I do not feel that this will improve the parking situation for residents of the area, as we will still be fighting over a limited number of spaces.</p> <p>Due to my work, I cannot stay in Bristol year round and have to move within a couple of months. This means I do not want to pay £100 for a permit that I will only use for a brief time. Is there anything proposed for temporary residents?</p> <p>I am also a health care worker where I undertake on call duties and need to be able to access my car quickly if I am called in. These restrictions will make this impossible. Greatly affecting work life.</p> <p>The ridiculous restrictions being proposed will undoubtedly put off huge numbers of visitors to the village and can only have a negative impact on businesses.</p>	<p>3.4</p> <p>1.2 1.4 3.3</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.3.1</p> <p>1.3 4</p>
1063		I'm not against charging for parking but the confusion of all the different time zones and especially	3.4

		the 1 hour parking is wrong. This will not allow visitors to enjoy the relaxed eating and shopping experience that Clifton Village has. I believe a blanket max 3 hours...simple and would suit everybody.	4.2
1064		<p>The consultation process was accelerated upon, what businesses believe to be ill-informed advice. There has been a lack of two-way dialogue.</p> <p>The plans included for the statutory consultation were not evidence based.</p> <p>There is inadequate public transport links to serve the village. It is made up of large and small organisations.</p> <p>Parking permit numbers for businesses is inadequate. The frontage formula has not been thought out and is flawed.</p> <p>One hour parking is not a viable option for visitors, shoppers and clients and will have a detrimental impact on trade. The four and five hour parking will be used by visitors of the zoo.</p> <p>Realistically it will be 12 months before any changes will be made. This is not an option for the businesses of Clifton Village, who may have already lost staff etc.</p> <p>Copies of objections we have already received were submitted again from:</p> <p>A petition with 300 online signatures and 2863 other signatures was submitted. The petition made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One hour parking limit in the centre of the village which retailers consider will be restrictive to their trade.</li> <li>Insufficient permits for businesses in order that they can complete their work effectively.</li> <li>Inadequate transport links to the village, two bus links is not sufficient for the needs of visitors, clients and employees.</li> </ul>	<p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>1 2.1</p> <p>4.5 4.6</p> <p>4.3 4.3.3</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>6</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>4.2 4.3 4.5</p>
1065		The operation hours should be the same as originally proposed and the same throughout the area. i.e. Mon-Fri 9am-5pm. This new proposal could have a serious effect on businesses in Clifton Village.	3.4

		<p>We believe that parking in Clifton Village should be for at least a minimum of three hours, not varying the time limits on different bays. One hour does not give visitors the opportunity to visit more than a couple of shops.</p> <p>On the original plans we saw for the residents parking there were bays on both sides of Grange road from its junction with Mortimer road – until it narrows before the cross roads with Manilla road. Now parking has been eliminated on the 25 yards stretch immediately before the junction. This takes away a minimum of five spaces. Please reinstate this – we need all the spaces we can get.</p> <p>We are concerned the council appear to be trying to rush the process, thereby not giving enough time for sensible residents and local businesses time to make appropriate comment. Will you please extend the consultation time?</p> <p>We have been told that the reason for the changes listed, were because of comments/objections made by people. We struggle to find people who support them. If the council are going to act on these comments then in a democracy we need to know how many were received and what they were.</p>	<p>4.2</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>2.1 2.2</p> <p>2.1</p>
1066		For too long the residents of Clifton have been bullied by a vociferous gang of self-appointed 'spokesmen' who seem to believe that they represent Clifton. They do not. I and the silent majority of residents in Clifton wholeheartedly support the scheme and do hope that you do not back down due to misinformation and lies perpetrated by opponents.	Comments noted
1067		<p>The suggested time limit of 1 hour free parking will have an adverse effect on our trade as a restaurant.</p> <p>40% of our trade is during the daytime. Our average lunch guests stays for a minimum of 2 hours. 80% of our guests are from outside the Clifton Village area, therefore need to drive here. Clifton Village is a destination for tourists the suggested time limit for parking will not attract new customers, hindering trade for all businesses. A potential loss of trade would lead to staff redundancies. The proposed parking scheme will significantly affect our potential investment in Clifton and Bristol in the future.</p> <p>We would like to offer a suggestion on the proposed parking scheme to extend free parking to a 3 hour period.</p>	<p>4.2 4.2.4</p> <p>4.2 1.3</p> <p>4.2.4</p>
1068		<p>Blue badge holders are not the only offenders although they are the worst as they tend to be away for the day at the Zoo. They are a real problem at week-ends.</p> <p>A huge number of other vehicles also park and ignore the yellow lines. This includes large commercial Zoo delivery vehicles and Clifton College traffic consisting of delivery vehicles and parents in cars. The commercial vehicles park up and wait for delivery space outside the Zoo. The college has a huge volume of commercial vehicles using the yellow line space to make deliveries and pick-ups even though the College has off street parking. This goes to the issue of safety. It is often</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>1.4 3.8</p>

	<p>completely impossible to see anything going up or down College Road and not only do we risk life and limb exiting our gates, we are in danger of injuring others.</p> <p>If we had a strip of 'No loading at any time' tacking lines they couldn't and that would reduce the problem considerably. Also commercial vehicles would see that they cannot legally load/unload in this area.</p> <p>The concept of the RPS is to reduce traffic and cars 'circulating in search of free space' in which to park but the RPS permit holders and paid for scheme only operates between Mon-Fri so the week-end chaos will continue and the scheme does not reflect the week-end economy of the Zoo and the traffic and parking issues in College Road.</p> <p>The disabled vehicles are more likely to park there once the scheme is implemented because the large disabled bay outside the Zoo has been re-designed a large loading bay for Zoo deliveries. The disabled vehicles will therefore park on the yellow lines unless the area is designated to be no loading/un-loading at any time.</p> <p>The fact that there is a maximum 3 hour allowance on yellow lines is routinely ignored by disabled drivers at weekends, Easter, summer holidays, Christmas etc.</p> <p>Perhaps a compromise on the yellow lines to the right of our gates as we exit College Road would be acceptable i.e. no loading up to the dropped kerb outside 38 College Road/Coulson Centre. That would at least allow us to see the Guthrie Road junction as we exit even if we can't see traffic coming down College Road.</p>	<p>5.18</p> <p>3.4 3.3.2</p> <p>5.18</p> <p>3.8</p> <p>5.18</p>
--	--	---

**\*Note:**

Appendix 4 reference refers to principal considerations, but is not exclusive (i.e. other elements included in this report may apply).